“Stones Can Make People Docile”: Disciplinary School Spaces and Student Rebellions in Children’s and Young Adult School Stories

Anah-Jayne Markland

A Dissertation Submitted to the
Faculty of Graduate Studies
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Graduate Program in Humanities
York University
Toronto, Ontario
February 2019

Abstract

School Stories is a subgenre within children's and young adult literature in which the school environment is the main and most pivotal site of action. Typically, student characters are socialized by their school experience to be responsible future adult citizens who will seamlessly fit within the hegemonic structures of their society. However, there is a stream within the school story subgenre in which the school space is oppressive and attempts to crush students into conformity. While a few studies have been conducted on the school story subgenre, there has yet to be significant attention paid to stories which are critical of institutional educational practices, or any that focus on how the material, physical, and architectural representation of school spaces facilitates students' empowering or oppressive experiences. This dissertation attempts to fill this gap by examining school stories that feature oppressive school environments by considering how the spatial properties contribute to the disciplinary structures of school spaces to create student oppression.

The present study focuses on stories with oppressive school spaces and questions the ideological structures these stories attempt to break down; the new structures they suggest be put in their place; the desired/imagined futures of institutionalized education these narratives express; and if, or how, implied readers are invited to internalize and enact these changes. To do this, I employ Michel Foucault and Henri Lefebrve's theories on disciplinary space, Michel de Certeau's arguments regarding individual resistances to disciplinary spaces, and affect theory to examine characters' emotional responses stimulated by the school space. Within school stories that feature oppression, the disciplinary organization of the school space directly influences the interactions of bodies within the space, and it is student characters' interactions with one another, and with adults in positions of authority, that elicit constrained and oppressive experiences. Student characters in this study rebel and resist the evasive net of discipline that those in positions of authority employ to order the school space and manipulate the student bodies housed within. Through the resistance of fictional students, these narratives recommend to child and youth readers non-conformist and even revolutionary attitudes that imagine students as the means of achieving changes to their various hegemonic societies.

Dedication

To Justin Markland and Carla Samuelson

And to Wallace, who was beside me at every stage and deserves his own honorary doctorate

Acknowledgements

It has taken a community to keep me focused and energized throughout this PhD.

First and foremost, I humbly thank Dr. Cheryl Cowdy for taking me on as her first Ph.D. student. Dr. Cowdy was generous with her time and energy, and she always coupled criticism with kindness. Thank you to my committee members Dr. Peter Cumming and Dr. Aparna Tarc for their hours of careful reading and words of support.

Thanks to York University for awarding me the Provost Dissertation Scholarship that enabled me a full year to focus solely on writing my dissertation.

Thank you to the Osborne Collection of Early Children's Literature in the Lillian Smith Library for granting me access to hundreds of Victorian and Edwardian school stories that set the foundation for my study.

Thank you to Katie Thorgeirson and Laura Orizzonte for the countless Skype dates, dinners, coffees, and glasses of wine that kept me sane and reminded me there is life outside academia. To Vanessa Evans, my York spouse, I thank for patiently listening to me talk through the writing roadblocks and celebrating all my PhD milestones.

I owe thanks to my entire extended family for supporting me, and who self-consciously limited the number of times they asked when the dissertation would be finished. Thank you to Sylvia Fuchek, whose blind faith in my abilities made me believe I could do anything. I thank my mother, Carla Samuelson, who made sure I had everything I needed to succeed—cans of "emergency" soup for when I got sick, filling my Toronto apartment with wine and flowers, and mailing me a new computer when mine spontaneously combusted. Thank you to my husband, Justin Markland, who was nothing but supportive of me pursuing my PhD, even though it meant we would live at opposite ends of the country for four years.

Table of Contents

Introduction

> "Tom's heart beat quick as he passed the great schoolfield. . . . [H]e began already to be proud of being a Rugby boy."
>
> —Thomas Hughes, *Tom Brown's School Days*
>
> "[I] looked up at the main building. I had a sudden surge of anger. I couldn't stand it anymore, being asked to accept that I had no control . . . over our lives."
>
> —Kate Scelsa, *Fans of the Impossible Life*

The "School Story" is a subgenre within children's and young adult (hereafter referred to as YA) literature in which the school environment is not merely one of several settings but functions as the main and most pivotal site of action. Rosemary Auchmuty contends that the school space in school stories functions as "a place where pupils grow through the exercise of independent self-will rather than being crushed into conformity" ("School Stories"). Conversely, Elisabeth Rose Gruner takes a less optimistic view and argues the school acts as a site of "homogenization and social control" for the school itself often stands for dominant societal ideals and expectations and functions as a miniature world that offers protagonists the opportunity to experiment with social structures (218). Protagonists are typically molded by their school experience into responsible future adult citizens, or, as Jack Zipes puts it, students are prepped "systematically to fit into institutions, teams, clubs, companies, associations, and corporations to succeed according to standards set by these hegemonic groups" (*Sticks* 19-20). In these stories, the school is largely utopian and idealized. Student characters leave their school socialized through a moral education that imbues character traits necessary for them to be future citizens who can bear the responsibility of protecting and maintaining their societies.

Within the subgenre of school stories there are several texts in which the school environment/space *does* indeed attempt to crush students into conformity by inhibiting their personal development, denying independence, refusing free thought, and repressing students who fall outside dominant societal standards. These school spaces facilitate oppressive disciplinary structures that often stir student resistance and rebellion aimed at revolutionizing the school space's disciplinary structures and to spur change in the surrounding community. Whether or not student rebellions are successful, there is often a great cost associated with championing change: protagonists frequently suffer trauma both from the stifling experience of institutionalized educational practices and from attempting to change them. Thus, some protagonists end their school careers too injured physically, emotionally, and/or psychologically to fit seamlessly into, or even function within, the adult world. Others, however, are stirred by their upsetting school experience to challenge and change the ideological structures that stifled them. In either case, the schools have produced individuals who are critical agents and thinkers who "reject a narrow conception of common sense as the engine of truth" (Giroux 120). Dominant ideological and cultural norms are not established or internalized (the traditional outcome of school stories), but rather these school stories blatantly challenge them by representing these norms and ideologies as damaging, repressive, and in need of reformation. Texts of this kind often invite implied child and youth readers to do several things: critique pedagogical practices, alter their expectations to include students as active participants in their education, offer space to imagine and think through alternatives to current methods of institutional education, and question dominant ideological structures.

While traditional school stories that endorse their particular dominant culture far outnumber subversive stories, the two trends indicate that the school story subgenre contains two

streams: one utopian and idealized, and the other dystopian and subversive. This is, perhaps, unsurprising, for children's and YA literature is often bifurcated by utopian and dystopian tendencies. Zipes argues that since Thomas More first described the imaginary island, Utopia, with its (arguably) perfect social, political, and governmental systems in which every *man* is treated fairly, utopia has since come to mean "an impossible idealistic projection" ("Foreword" x). Literature for young readers frequently incorporates utopian tendencies because of what Zipes describes as the "lack we feel in our lives, a discernible discontent, and a yearning for a better condition or world" ("Foreword" ix). Dystopian tendencies are born from a similar yearning, for often the pursuit of perfection leads to perverted societies that are "projected as dystopias in literary works for young and old readers" (Zipes "Foreword," xi). Carrie Hintz and Elaine Ostry argue that both utopian and dystopian texts in children's and YA literature are concerned with social organization: "[These] works propose to teach the young reader about governance, the possibility of improving society, the role of the individual and the limits of freedom" (1). Texts that employ utopian elements often offer idealized and romanticized images of the "unspoiled state of childhood" (Hintz and Ostry 1), whereas dystopian texts often depict "traumatic social and personal awakenings. . . [and feature] a loss of innocence" (Hintz and Ostry 9).

Within the two streams of school stories, the school is either portrayed as an idealized and romanticized space that provides students the disciplinary structures they need to mature into well-rounded adults, or it is disparaged as an out-of-date space that should be torn down, brick by brick, because of its damaging effects on students. In both, what kind of disciplinary structures are informed by the architectural school space determines students' school experience. While a few studies have been conducted on the school story subgenre as a distinct subgenre

within children's and British literature, there has yet to be significant attention paid to stories which are critical of institutional educational practices, or any that focus on the ways in which the material, physical, and architectural school space facilitates disciplinary structures that either empower or oppress student characters.

This dissertation attempts to fill this gap by examining school stories that feature oppressive school environments by considering how the spatial properties contribute to disciplinary structures that create student oppression, and studying how fictional students resist these spaces and structures. I examine the relation of school spaces (their materiality and organization) and student-bodies, and how the two (spaces and bodies) co-construct affective responses, as well as what "surface ideologies" (social, political, and moral beliefs) the authors recommend to implied readers through these narratives.[1] I focus on stories with oppressive school spaces and question the ideological structures these stories attempt to break down; the new structures they suggest be put in their place; the desired/imagined futures of institutionalized education these narratives express; and if, or how, implied readers are invited to internalize and enact these changes. To do this, I employ Michel Foucault's and Henri Lefebrve's theories on disciplinary space, Michel de Certeau's arguments regarding individual resistances to disciplinary spaces, and affect theory to examine characters' emotional responses stimulated by the school environment/space. I argue that within school stories that feature oppression, the disciplinary organization of the schools are facilitated by the architectural school spaces and

[1] "Surface Ideologies," a term developed by Peter Hollindale, are explicit statements of social, political and moral ideologies that adult writers of children's and YA literature recommend to their implied child and youth readers. Perry Nodelman and Mavis Reimer argue that it is at the level of surface ideologies in which "fiction carries new ideas, non-conformist or revolutionary attitudes, and efforts to change imaginative awareness in line with contemporary social criticism" (151)

directly influence the interactions of bodies within the space, and it is student characters' interactions with one another, and with adults in positions of authority, that elicits constrained and oppressive experiences. Student characters in this study rebel and resist the evasive net of discipline that those in positions of authority employ to order the school space and manipulate the student bodies housed within. Through the resistance of fictional students, these narratives recommend to child and youth readers non-conformist and even revolutionary attitudes that imagine students as the means of achieving changes to hegemonic society (Nodelman and Reimer 151).[2]

The School Story

School is habitually used as one of several settings in children's and YA literature, yet those that can be considered school stories are grounded and concentrated in the school space. In school stories, and within this dissertation, "school" is the organizing forum in which education is taking place. A distinguishing and key feature of school stories is they are set *primarily* within a school space. The school setting does not function as one of many settings, but it is the *most* pivotal site that informs the action of the narrative. If any outside settings are portrayed, they directly relate to what is happening in the school environment. Limited narrative time is spent in classrooms during lessons,[3] and it is characters' interactions with one another and adult faculty

---

[2] "Hegemony" is understood in the context of this study as the dominance of one ideological, political, social, and economic vision over all oppositional views (Coleman 60). Within each chapter of this dissertation, what is understood as the "hegemonic society" shifts with the changing time period and country of publication. For example, colonial and imperial values are dominant in the Golden Age school stories, whereas competitive neoliberal values are central in the later American published novels. These shifts will be discussed in more detail throughout the chapters of this dissertation.

[3] There are of course some exceptions. J. K. Rowling's *Harry Potter* series spends significant time in the classroom, and characters are later shown to put what they learn to practical use (this

within the school space that supply the most valuable education. The organization of the school space influences the interactions of bodies within the space, and it is in these interactions that characters are socialized and receive their moral education.

Why Study School Stories?

School stories, whether they be set in boarding or day schools, are worthy of study for several reasons. First, for many children, a large percentage of their lives is spent in school, as education is viewed by many as the "business of the child's life" (Gruner 216). Childhood Studies prioritizes the examination of children's material and everyday lives, and as "going to school" is a significant aspect in the everyday lives of numerous children, it makes school, and the stories about school, an important topic to scrutinize to more fully understand conceptions of childhood and youth. Furthermore, Pierre Bourdieu argues that *habitus* (our condition of existence) informs the dispositions and habits of an individual or group. School spaces provide one such "particular class of conditions of existence" that constructs a *habitus* many young people inhabit, and that informs individuals' and collectives' "durable, transposable dispositions" (*Logic* 53). *Habitus* "produces individual and collective practices" (*Logic* 54), and thus interrogating the conditions of existence of school spaces, and the representation of these spaces, is necessary to uncover and understand the enduring dispositions of individuals and collectives that have been produced by the experience of going to school.

A distinction must be made between the child-student "in the text" and the child-student "outside the text." The majority of school stories, like children's and YA literature generally, are

---

is discussed in detail in Chapter Six). Meg Wolitzer's *Belzhar* (2015) explores a Special Topics in English course, and classroom discussions and assignments aid in students' healing from traumatic events in their lives.

written by adults for children and youth, and this creates an inherent and inescapable gulf between the writers of school stories and their intended or implied child and youth readers. Jacqueline Rose argues that "[c]hildren's fiction sets up the child as an outsider to its own process, and then aims, unashamedly, to take the child in" (2). According to Rose, there are no "real" children in children's fiction, not only because children are not actually creating the fiction, but because the children present in the literature are the ones whom adults have constructed. In the case of school stories, the adult author writes about a subject that is an everyday lived experience for many children, claims authority over the subject through his or her writing, and attempts to seduce his or her implied readers to regard school as they do. Beverly Lyon Clark notes that "[a] story about a school is a school," and that school stories "thematize their own textuality—or rather their own moral purpose. Schooling is . . . a metaphor for the effect that the book is supposed to have, whether it endorses traditional schooling or tries to school us in subversion" (7). Similarly, Nodelman and Reimer argue that children's literature

> represents an effort by adults to colonize children: to make them believe that they ought to be the way adults would like them to be, and to make them feel guilty about or downplay the significance of all the aspects of their selves that inevitably don't fit the adult model. It might be one more (and very powerful) aspect of the tyranny of the norm. (97)

Rather than school stories directly reflecting the lived experience of students, they communicate what sort of students adults may wish children to be: school stories educate children and youth on how to be students. As my study does not conduct research with children and youth, I focus on dominant assumptions adult authors attempt to communicate to young readers through school stories. While going to school is, and has been, a lived experience of many children and youth,

this does not automatically translate into adult written narratives about school representing actual children and youths' material and lived experiences. Often, they may link more directly to the adult authors' own memories and perceptions of what the school experience was like for them, or what they wish it had been. Therefore, the "child in the text" may have a markedly closer relationship to the memory of the child in the author than to the child "outside of the text."

Secondly, Clark argues that school stories are important works to be studied as they "embody the crises and values of their age" (9). School stories function as time capsules that allow us to examine and uncover crises and values related to the notions of children, childhood, and youth in numerous cultures and time periods. Likewise, the common overt pedagogical agenda of school stories makes the genre important for educators and scholars to interrogate, for they often blatantly promote hegemonic ideological systems. As Gruner states, "Education is concerned . . . with power" (218), and interrogating narratives that focus on power structures that attempt to "regulate the ways in which children develop agency in the world" (Gruner 218), that are largely then read by children and youth, needs to be conducted for educators, scholars, and students to better understand, and possibly disturb, power structures. Subversive school stories provide genre-disruptive narratives that explore young characters' experimentation with preconceived dominant ideological systems and specifically call into question children's and youths' agency, power, and place within "adult" society. As Clark argues, to examine school stories "enables one to probe the intersections of literature and pedagogy and the politics of schooling" (10). School stories which present oppressive school spaces create an opening to critically question pedagogical practices and expose hierarchical systems of power as unjustly disenfranchising youth.

Origins of the School Story Genre

The school story subgenre began in Britain with the public-school story,[4] but scholars disagree as to which text officially launched the school story subgenre and when. Auchmuty attributes the school story's origins to the British domestic tales of the mid-eighteenth to mid-nineteenth centuries that showed the moral development of characters through personal hardship, and the original school story as Sarah Fielding's *The Governess; or, Little Female Academy* (1749), which is the first domestic tale to be set entirely in a school.[5] P. W. Musgrave also places the school story's origins within domestic tales for children, but cites Maria Edgeworth's short story "The Barring Out," included in her nursey classic *Parents' Assistant* (1796), as the "first recognisable English school story" (26). Isabel Quigly makes the most popular argument that the school story was born with Thomas Hughes's *Tom Brown's Schooldays* (1857). Clark combines the previous arguments and signals texts like Fielding's and Edgeworth's as precursors of the subgenre, and Hughes as the author who introduced the narratives' conventional formula that "influenced the hundreds of subsequent school stories" (11). *Tom Brown* relies heavily on the domestic texts that came before and is chiefly a didactic novel concerned with the socialization of children, and Clark argues that Hughes "laid bare the opposition between student and teacher undermining . . . the conservatism of the earlier school story. . . . [H]e empowered children" (11). The influence of Hughes in the establishment of school stories as a distinct subgenre with its own conventions cannot be understated, for it was Hughes who introduced the ordinary and good-natured protagonist, battles on the playing fields, midnight feasts, moral dilemmas around

[4] British public schools are boarding schools that charge fees. Not to be confused with American and Canadian public schools that are state-funded, British public schools are independent from the state and called "public" because they are open to anyone who can pay the tuition fees.
[5] Sarah Fielding is the sister of author Henry Fielding who is, arguably, most well-known for his novel *The History of Tom Jones, a Foundling* (1749).

telling tales, and the benevolent Headmaster who unobtrusively ushers his students through their moral education.

F. W. Farrar's *Eric; or, Little by Little* (1858) was published a year after *Tom Brown* and offered a much different school story, which Auchmuty argues "demonstrated the flexibility of the genre" ("School Stories"). Both novels were written with didactic intentions: Hughes's novel "preaches to boys" with "cheerful, attractive preaching, which reconciled his readers to his didactic approach" (Quigly 68); Farrar's novel assumes a highly sentimental and moralistic tone and surrounds his protagonist with "strict, [and] a narrowly interpreted set of rules outside which there is no hope of moral safety or final salvation" (Quigly 71). Robert Kirkpatrick notes that the two different approaches to the same didactic end of Hughes and Farrar influenced the subgenre to proceed down three distinct paths: the penny dreadful melodrama; the evangelical school stories with delicate heroes and zealous friendships; and the paradigmatic school story which was predominately concerned with schoolboy/girl honour in the context of sports, fagging,[6] fights, midnight feasts, and breaking rules (2).

Hughes's and Farrar's novels also ushered in the three significant plot conventions present in all three subgenre streams that Kirkpatrick delineates: conflict surrounding the insurrection of students, fagging, and tale-telling. These three oft-repeated devices ushered in the plot device of what I term safe rebellions. Safe rebellions are those which do not challenge or threaten the disciplinary structures of the school space, but ultimately endorse and valorize the space, and involve students' experimentation with the boundaries of school rules (for example, having a midnight feast after lights out) in order to gain respect for them. These rebellions do not

[6] Fagging is when lower year students do menial tasks (to "fag") for senior students such as providing tea and snacks, cleaning out seniors' studies, doing laundry and so forth.

offer any real threat to the safety of student characters, nor do they disturb the ideological structures of the school, but rather, and most often, they validate existing power structures by garnering students' respect for the structures. Many of these safe rebellions are co-opted by adult members of the school who believe this type of rebellion is essential to the moral education and character formation of students. Safe rebellions allow students to push and test boundaries as a means of developing character traits of leadership, bravery, loyalty, and obedience.

In the case of stories that build on the heavy-handed morality of Farrar, the safe rebellions are potentially dangerous in that they act as cautionary tales for the depravity and moral decay that can result if students do not learn to respect authority or do not develop the essential character traits (namely loyalty and obedience) that their safe rebellions should foster. Farrar's Eric, who faces similar temptations to Hughes's Tom, chooses to follow the more attractive road of vice rather than curb his egoistical desires to be moulded into a responsible British citizen. Farrar's novel ends at Eric's deathbed where he expresses deep regret over not bending to the just power structures of his public school, and he dies peaceful only after learning his name has been cleared at the school (*Eric* 482, 485). Though his rebellions have mortal consequences, his deathbed regrets affirm the justness of the school's power structures.

Following Hughes and Farrar, the school story subgenre blossomed and experienced its Golden Age for roughly a century: from the mid-nineteenth-century to mid-twentieth century. The school story subgenre of this period can be further broken down into two categories: boys' and girls' school stories. Although the two categories were aimed at two distinct readerships, the overt similarities between the genres have been downplayed, and the boys' category has traditionally received far more scholarly attention than its counterpart for girls. Scholars such as Quigly and Musgrave regard the boys' subgenre as more literary than girls' stories. Quigly is

highly disparaging of girls' school stories and believes that "[a]mong writers of school stories for girls . . . there was no one anywhere near the level of Kipling or Wodehouse, or even of Reed, Walpole or Turley," and that "it is very hard to consider them [girls' school stories] as more than (occasionally charming) kitsch" (212). In his methodical study of the public-school story genre, Musgrave largely ignores the existence of the girls' school story and mentions them only briefly in his last chapter. Even in this brief section, more focus is given to the rumour of female readers reading boys' school stories than an examination of actual examples of girls' school stories (Musgrave 231). Girls' school stories were uniformly written by female authors, and Musgrave's and Quigly's attitudes could suggest a bias towards female authors more generally.

More recent scholarship has begun to give girls' school stories, and their authors, the credit and attention they are due. Judith Humphrey notes the significance of girls' school stories in their being

> amongst the few texts written by women for women about women. . . . [They] created a world where women are autonomous, authoritative and in control, where they are the most significant people in the universe, and where their lives, their intellectual and emotional development and their relationships with other women are prioritized. (1)

Breaking down the distinction between the two categories, Auchmuty notes it is no coincidence that "the girls' school story, like the girls' public school, emerged about 50 years after its masculine counterpart" (*World* 58), and that girls' stories "owed as much to the emerging tradition of boys' school stories as it did to any real school tradition" (*World* 57). While there are some significant differences between the two subgenres, which will be discussed in further detail in Chapter One, this project aims to look at girl's and boys' school stories side by side as being part of one whole, instead of two distinct and separate types. The two subgenres are equally

important to the development and expansion of the school story subgenre, and it is reductive and false to consider the girls' genre as inevitably lacking the depth, complexity, and the literary merit of its male counterparts.

Due to the subgenre's birth and its Golden Age residing almost exclusively in the halls of British public schools, some scholars exclude stories from the same and later time periods that take place in day schools. For example, Auchmuty and Clark argue that the public-school setting is central to the subgenre of school stories, and both scholars, as well as Musgrave and Quigly, exclude any mention of texts that take place in day schools or that are published after the 1950s. Musgrave makes a small gesture towards day schools and more recent school stories by concluding his study with reference to Robert Cormier's *The Chocolate War* (1975). Musgrave notes similarities between Cormier's novel and fundamental school stories like Rudyard Kipling's *Stalky and Co* (1899). Musgrave concludes that Cormier's novel is not didactic enough and includes too much violence, and thus he discredits its being a school story but rather an "adolescent problem story set in a school" (258). This is a reductive reading of *The Chocolate War,* and Cormier's novel should be considered a school story because of its focus on how relationships are forged and maintained by the power structures of the school space. Rather than its differences from older examples excluding Cormier's novel from the subgenre, the deviations demonstrate that Cormier expands and reimagines the subgenre.

Conversely, Heather Julien argues that "[s]tories set in day schools can be more intensely concerned with school life than boarding school stories," and stories set in day schools have greater social interest than boarding school stories, "[u]ndoubtedly . . . due to their greater focus on class and social mobility" (3). To focus exclusively on public or boarding school stories, mostly set in nineteenth-century Britain, results in the inspection of narratives with narrow class

and geographical settings and limits the extent to which their influence on children's material and everyday lives can be examined. Much like Julien, I argue that the school story subgenre should be extended to include day schools. Although there are obvious differences between day and boarding schools, the school space, the pedagogical practices and philosophy, as well as the hierarchical power structures between students and faculty, are much the same in both. Thus, I, unlike Auchmuty and Clark, include day schools within my definition of school stories.

Explicitly tying the school story subgenre to the public-school space, Musgrave and Quigly rule the school story as dying with the public-school story. Quigly ends her study of *Tom Brown* and its heirs with the argument that the school story ground to a halt in the 1940s as "[t]he school story flourished while the public schools, in their nineteenth-century form, flourished. When they joined the modern world the school story died" (276). When writing in 1985, Musgrave pronounced the genre "almost dead before the Second World War" (1), waiting for a "writer of genius" to take "the genre and remake it" (240-1), and he argued the genre "consist[s] of a residue from the past to which few new additions are now made" (241). It is undeniable that the school story has declined in quantity post-1940s, but the quality and growth of the subgenre are far from stagnant. What Quigly and Musgrave observe is the decline of the public school functioning as the most common school setting, but this does not necessarily translate to the end of the subgenre. To disregard narratives that take place in school spaces alternative to public schools ignores how the subgenre has persevered past the 1940s and been reinterpreted outside of Britain, and neglects how the diversity of school settings utilized has expanded the subgenre to afford more complicated and nuanced depictions of class, gender, sexuality, race, ethnicity, culture, and nationhood.

Both Musgrave and Quigly cling to the conventions started with *Tom Brown* and *Eric*, and when text such as *The Chocolate War* remake the subgenre too much they are not categorized as school stories. Cormier's novels are as didactic as other forms of children's literature, school stories specifically (Cadden), and are highly political and teach critical thinking and rebellion rather than obedience and loyalty (MacLeod; Iskander; Lopez-Ropero). The school in *The Chocolate War* is as concerned with the socialization and moral education of students as Hughes's Rugby, the school acts as the main and most pivotal site of action, and Cormier's fictional students deal with the same issues of bullying, sports, telling tales, and breaking school rules. The key difference, that Quigly and Musgrave do not accept, is that Cormier's fictional student rebellions are against the oppressive school space and aim to reform and revolutionize the space. Cormier's protagonist's attempt to "disturb the universe" threatens the ideological power structures of the school space and rules his rebellion dangerous (Cormier 123, 248). The school story lives, and the texts examined in this study expand the school story subgenre by presenting student rebellions that threaten to destabilize the hierarchical power structures of their school spaces due to students' revolutionary attitudes and active citizenship.

The Continuation and Expansion of School Stories

School stories have yet to be published in the same numbers as during their Golden Age, but the subgenre has not died—rather, it has evolved in content and medium. Many of the popular girls' school story series continued to publish into the 1970s and beyond, greatly challenging the notion that there is a definitive end of Golden Age public school stories: Elinor Brent-Dyer's last *Chalet* book, *Prefects of the Chalet School*, was published in 1970; Pamela Cox continued Enid Blyton's *St. Clare*'s series into 2008 with *Kitty at St. Clare's*. In the case of Blyton's *St. Clare's*

series, adaptions of the series continue its relevance into new generations and cultures: for example, St. Clare's is adapted in the 1991 Japanese anime series *Mischievous Twins: The Tales of St. Clare's* and in four German films *Hanni & Nanni* (2010, 2012, 2013, 2017).

The serialization of school stories has continued both with the continued popularity of series like Blyton's *Malory Towers* and *St. Clare's* and Brent-Dyer's *Chalet School*, and in new series such as *Sweet Valley High* (1984-1996, 181 books total) which is centralized in a high school space; Louis Sachar's *Wayside School* series (1978-94), set in a school built thirty floors high; Svetlana Chmakova's *Berrybrook Middle School* graphic novel series (2015-ongoing), that is focalized through a different student's point of view in each novel; and James Patterson's *Middle School* series (2011-ongoing), that closely follows in Tom Brown's footsteps with sixth grader Rafe Khatchadorian's attempts to break every school rule. More in the tradition of L.T. Meade and Talbot Baines Reed, who wrote hundreds of school stories but rarely in the same school or with the same characters, authors like Judy Blume and Jerry Spinelli have written dozens of unconnected school stories. All these examples function within the utopian stream of school stories, and any conflict in the plot is a character-fortifying lesson, with characters typically experiencing a renewed respect for their school and excitement to be a part of the community by the narrative's end.

With the introduction of new visual technologies, like television, the serialization of school stories has migrated to the small screen. *Saved by the Bell* (1989-1993) follows a group of high school students as they comedically deal with serious social issues; the extremely popular and critically acclaimed musical comedy-drama *Glee* (2009-2015) follows the fictional William McKinley High School glee club for five seasons; and, most recently, the drama *Riverdale* (2017-ongoing) is based on the *Archie Comics* and follows high school students as they navigate

the mysteries of their town. The Canadian television series *Degrassi* has totalled over 620 episodes over five series' incarnations, making it the longest sustained television series based in a school (*The Kids of Degrassi Street* [1982-86], *Degrassi Junior High* [1987-89], *Degrassi High* [1989-91], *Degrassi: The Next Generation* [2001-2010], and *Degrassi: Next Class* [2016-ongoing]). Though anecdotal, I have several memories of my Junior High health teacher showing our class episodes from *Degrassi Junior High* and *Degrassi High* that corresponded with our weekly topics such as alcohol and drug use, the dangers of driving under the influence of alcohol, and teen pregnancy. While I cannot speak to whether this was a common teaching tool in Canadian schools, in at least my own experience *Degrassi*, like school stories, acted as a school and was considered by my teacher a useful socialization/educational tool.[7]

It stands to reason that school stories would also be transplanted to film. There have been several significant trends of high school films directed towards an adolescent audience. Timothy Shary notes that the "school film" is unlike other adolescent film subgenres in its dependence on character types, much like school stories, to ensure the "recognition of its styles and narrative interests" (*Generation* 78), and that characters "tend to declare and/or resist their identification through character stereotypes yet remain identified accordingly" (*Generation* 79). The school is presented as a building of "social evolution" (*Generation* 26), and a milieu for the cultural discipline of youth in which youth are "most clearly divided into distinct types with certain levels of achievement and acceptance according to that development and disciplining"

[7] Research suggests my personal experience is not an isolated event. In 1989, Mark Walsh reported the show was a popular resource in U.S and Canadian classrooms and cites that the distributor (WGBH) distinctly "promote[ed] its use in schools with discussion and activity guides for teachers, a newspaper supplement for students, and other efforts" (Walsh). In 1992, Robin J. Kirsch created for WGBH a six unit "health curriculum" made available to teachers for purchase that used episodes from *Degrassi* as a "springboard for an in-depth exploration of an adolescent health issue" (Kirsch).

(*Generation* 27). Shary cites five basic character types in school films that primarily drive conflict: methods by which "nerds" seek to transform themselves; tactics delinquents use to express their anger; rebels' actions to resist conformity; the efforts of popular girls to gain notoriety; and signals athletes use to display their (deep-rooted) sensitivity (*Generation* 32). Not inconsequently, these five conflicts are also commonly utilized in post-Golden Age school stories and reveal the extent to which literary conventions have leaked into and influenced film depictions of the same space.

Director John Hughes expertly navigated these character types without "making fun of the trials of teenhood" (Gora 2) and was sensitive to the struggles of youth in the 1980s in several comedy-drama school films: *The Breakfast Club* (1985), *Ferris Bueller's Day Off* (1986), and *Pretty in Pink* (1986). Hughes drew from his own experiences as a high school student and frequently reflected on the intense ways the social structure of his high school affected him (Gora 10). *The Breakfast Club* in particular has each of the five characters embody a distinct character type: the popular girl, the athlete, the working-class delinquent, the socially awkward nerd, and the off-centered goth girl. During their shared Saturday morning detention, the five engage in a group therapy session that pushes and dismantles each character's preconceived prejudices about the others. The late 1990s saw another resurgence of popular teen school films with 1999 acting as an especially pivotal year. *Clueless* (1995), *Election* (1999), *10 Things I Hate About You* (1999), *She's All That* (1999), *Never Been Kissed* (1999), *American Pie* (1999), and *Jawbreaker* (1999) all take place in the high school space, played with the five character types Shary delineates, and tackle the hierarchical power structures of peer relationships predicated by the high school space. These films do not depict the utopic school space of the Golden Age public school, but school is a mundane and ordinary space that is often an

annoyance to endure. Many of these films assign the blame for the "strife" that exists among school peers as the fault of educational systems, and "responsibility is placed on teachers and administrators who are sorely out of touch with their students, parents who are self-absorbed and as immature as their children, and the students, who succumb too easily to the pressures of acceptance" (Shary, *Teen Movies*, 79-80). By the end of the films, characters are either able to improve the social structure of their school spaces by changing their own treatment of peers, or they graduate from the space and look forward to being free of the space and its constraints.

More recently children's and YA school stories tackle a specific "problem" within the school space. Sharon G. Flake's *The Skin I'm In* (1998), Gene Luen Yang's *American Born Chinese* (2006), and Sherman Alexie's *The Absolutely True Diary of a Part-Time Indian* (2007) all deal with protagonists' struggles to cultivate self-worth despite the racial discrimination and prejudices they face daily from peers. The difficulties of being queer within heteronormative educational spaces are explored in Raina Telgemeier's graphic novel *Drama* (2012), Patrick Ness's *The Rest of us Just Live Here* (2015), Kate Scelsa's *Fans of the Impossible Life* (2015), and Becky Albertalli's *Simon vs. the Homo Sapiens Agenda* (2015). Growing in popularity and frequency are depictions of mental illnesses such as depression and suicide (John Green's *Looking for Alaska* [2005], and Matthew Quick's *Every Exquisite Thing* [2016]); schizophrenia and personality disorders (James Patterson and Chris Tebbetts's *Middle School: The Worst Years of My Life* [2011] and Tamera Ireland Stone's *Every Last Word* [2015]); and post-traumatic stress disorders (Meg Wolitzer's *Belzhar* [2015]). Physical disabilities and challenging able-bodied prejudices in the school space are the focus of R. J. Palacio's *Wonder* (2012), Sharon M. Draper's *Out of My Mind* (2010), and Cece Bell's *El Deafo* (2014). The difficulty of finding and maintaining meaningful and supportive friendships throughout school years is a topic too

commonly used for me to do justice with a brief inclusion, but graphic novels such as Svetlana Chmakova's *Brave* (2017) and Shannon Hale and LeUyen Pham's *Real Friends* (2017) are two very recent additions that socialize readers on friendship skills to use with school peers.

Most of these single-problem school stories present transitional school spaces that begin as oppressive but are transformed into supportive communities through the characters developing empathy. The school space is altered by newly formed compassionate peer relationships, often because oppressive students have learned to be empathic towards those they oppressed, and this dismantles prejudice in the school and surrounding community. Conversely, oppressed characters in texts such as Yang's *American Born Chinese* and Draper's *Out of My Mind* learn to separate their self-worth from being determined by the prejudiced opinions of others, and a smaller-scale transformation takes hold in individual characters' changed perceptions of themselves and others. In both cases, these (largely) single-problem school stories figure the moral education afforded by student relationships within the microcosm of school space as capable of reforming all forms of discrimination within larger (adult) society.

Predecessors to the Current Study

To date, there have been five major systematic studies conducted on the school story subgenre, each which continue to be frequently cited in scholarship. First is J. R. Honey's 1977 study, *Tom Brown's Universe: The Development of English Public School in the Nineteenth Century*. Honey takes an in-depth look at the development of boys' public schools in nineteenth-century England and argues that Thomas Hughes's *Tom Brown's School Days* and F.W. Farrar's *Eric; or Little by Little* influenced actual schools to change their practices to fit what was represented in these popular stories. For example, athleticism became universal in the late Victorian public-school

system, and Honey argues this was "the product of the great industry of school fiction" (117). Rather than legendary Rugby Headmaster Thomas Arnold (who, in truth, saw sports as a distraction from academics) developing the importance of sportsmanship in schools (as it has been believed), Honey argues it was Hughes's depiction of Arnold doing so in *Tom Brown* that sparked the popularity of athleticism. Honey's argument can be seen in the present as policies or movements in school stories are transplanted to actual schools. The "No Name-Calling Week" invented by characters in James Howe's *The Misfits* school story series (2001-14) has turned into an organization run by the publisher in conjunction with the Gay, Lesbian & Straight Education Network (GLSEN) organization that includes purchasable lesson plans and school resources, and the "Choose Kind" campaign run by the publishers of Palacio's *Wonder* offers school-wide and classroom resources inspired by Mr. Dyer's precept lessons in the novel ("For Teachers").

Isabel Quigly's 1982 study, *The Heirs of Tom Brown: The English School Story*, and P.W. Musgraves' 1985 study, *From Brown to Bunter: The Life and Death of the School Story*, both examine boys' public-school stories from the nineteenth to mid-twentieth centuries, and they are still widely used and applied to current studies that engage with school stories. For example, Christine Doyle and Susan Louise Steward use Musgrave in their examination of Orson Scott Card's science fiction school story *Ender's Game* (1977), and Eric Tribunella uses Quigly in his examination of "queerness" in John Knowles's novel, *A Separate Peace* (1959). Musgrave and Quigly provide a historical overview of the subgenre, and they both track its origin and development into the early twentieth century.

Rosemary Auchmuty's 1992 study *A World of Girls* is an innovative work that exclusively considers the girls' school story serializations by Elsie Oxenham, Elinor Brent-Dyer, Dorita Fairlie Bruce, and Enid Blyton. While Auchmuty's work is more concentrated than the

others in her focus on four authors, this concentration is merited in the prolific breadth of work produced by these authors and their exclusion from previous studies. If read in tandem with Honey, Quigly, and Musgrave, a comprehensive view of the early school story subgenre can be gleaned. Auchmuty approaches the study from her own childhood love of girls' school stories, and she found in conversation with other women that there was an agreement that "ideas about women's capabilities and roles had been shaped by the strong adventurous heroines of the school stories they had read" (3). Auchmuty disagrees wholeheartedly that these four authors' works do not demonstrate the same literary merit as their male counterparts, and she addresses the condemnation of the stories from critics with the charges that these critics "seek . . . to impose not only their own versions of reality upon the child but also their own interpretations of the *child's* reality" (14, emphasis original). More than boys' school stories, girls' school stories functioned as an escape from patriarchal society into a supportive matriarchal space completely governed by women, and in which "women's emotional and social energies are directed towards other women, and women's friendships are seen as positive, not destructive or competitive, and sufficient unto themselves" (7). It is for these reasons that Auchmuty considers girls' school stories radical and imperative in offering positive and empowering female role models "set against a reality which is often restrictive or hostile to them" (7).

The most recent study is Beverly Lyon Clark's 1996 work, *Regendering the School Story*. Clark's work has been so influential that it is difficult to find scholarship on the school story published after Clark's book that does *not* refer to her study. Kenneth Kidd argues in his review of *Regendering the School Story* that Clark is set apart from Quigly and Musgrave in that she notes "the traditional inattention to both girls' stories and gender itself . . . [and that she] explores less canonical 'crossgendered' school stories" ("Crosswriting" 215). Clark extends her lens

before *Tom Brown* to examine the domestic children's stories of the late 1700s and early 1800s, and argues these works lay the foundation for the genre and also offer greater opportunities for "crosswriting": when the author is not the same gender as his or her characters. Clark argues that post-*Tom Brown* crosswriting in school stories ceased, and the representation of gendered traits in the stories was more cemented. Although Clark does apply a queer lens theoretically to examine school stories and pays attention to texts that were ignored in the previous works I have mentioned, like Quigly and Musgrave she limits her study to public-school stories published before the 1900s. The "big five" are very much indicative of a large majority of scholarship regarding school stories because of their focus on gender, or the more recent examples that employ queer theory, to examine gender and sexuality in mainly British, and some American, public-school stories.

Since the turn of the new millennium, other scholars have continued to draw from the scholarship of Honey, Quigly, Musgrave, Auchmuty, and Clark to venture into new territory: J. K. Rowling's *Harry Potter* series (1997-2007). While it is promising that scholars are broadening their scope to primary texts published in the last two decades, the proliferation of scholarship returning to *Harry Potter* does little to open the conversation towards other interesting and important work being published in the school story subgenre. While there are some examples of scholars who examine school stories beyond *Harry Potter* and nineteenth-to mid-twentieth century boarding school stories*,* these examples are few and far between, and their scholarship to date is published in stand-alone articles, not major works that consider the subgenre as a whole.[8]

[8] For example, in "*Ender's Game* and *Ender's Shadow*: Orson Scott Card's Postmodern School Stories," (2004) Doyle and Steward examine *Ender's Game* as a postmodern school story that challenges readers not only to think differently about education and the relationships between

It has been over two decades since a full-length study on school stories has been undertaken. To my knowledge, a study that looks at public-school stories and day school stories together, and that analyzes boys' and girls' school stories together, has not yet been undertaken, and this is necessary to interrogate the function of the school story in reflecting and challenging dominant societal values beyond the narratives regarding upper-class British protagonists. As well, there has yet to be any scholarship about school stories that interrogates the spatial aspects of schools as I do. It is surprising that the school space itself has not been more fully analyzed, as in its many incarnations it functions as one of the primary characters in the subgenre. Not examining the material, physical, and architectural representation of school space and how it acts upon student bodies in school stories has been an oversight in scholarship, and thus provides a fruitful place to start a new conversation regarding the subgenre and how it has continued post-Golden Age.

Sources and Methodology

This study is interested in the relationality of bodies and space, specifically student bodies and institutional school spaces. In each chapter, the architectural and spatial properties of schools as material and physical spaces are considered, and how the architectural structures are utilized by adult staff to facilitate the disciplinary structures that oppress student bodies. It is the architectural (the organization and materiality of the physical space) and spatial properties (the

---

adults and children but also about what it means to be human. Likewise, in "Why Won't Melinda Just Talk about What Happened? *Speak* and the Confessional Voice," (2009) Chris McGee discusses Laurie Halse Anderson's *Speak* (1999) and argues that Melinda's initial refusal to speak illuminates issues concerning why adults demand teens speak, and what they expect to hear from teens when they finally do. Lastly, in "Refusing the Queer Potential" (2002), Eric L. Tribunella examines the "insidious" (82) methods *A Separate Peace* uses to inscribe heteronormative gender and sexuality standards in adolescent men.

disciplinary structures) of the school space combined with students' comprehension of these structures that facilitates the idyllic or oppressive narratives present in the two streams of school stories. Significantly, the spatial and architectural spaces do not change radically from stream to stream, throughout time, or from boarding to day school; it is how bodies and spaces co-construct affect and the surface ideologies of authors that has altered, and this indicates a shift in the didactic aim of authors from socializing readers to be obedient and loyal to the state to being critical thinkers suspicious of institutional structures.

Foucault, the Body, and Discipline: Stones Can Make People Docile

Michel Foucault argues in *Discipline and Punish* (1975) that bodies are made docile by space—specifically architecture. The intention of Foucault's study is to provide a "correlative history of the modern soul and of a new power to judge" (23), and from this intention his study does the following: regards punishment as a complex social function; regards punishment as a political tactic; and discovers whether the transformation of punishment has effected the transformation of the bodies invested in power relations (23-4). Systems of punishment are "situated" in the "political economy" of the body, making it so that "it is always the body that is at issue—the body and its forces, their utility and their docility, their distribution and their submission" (25). The body is a political field in which "power relations" strive to have hold of the body and so they "invest it, mark it, train it, torture it, force it to carry out tasks, to perform ceremonies, to emit signs" (25). It is a body's economic uses, not just monetary gain, but also as a force of production capable of extending or ending ruling power's dominance, that bounds political investments to the body. Because of the potentially powerful production of bodies, power relations seek to make bodies useful, subjective (instruments of power or violence), and

productive (26). The future of a society is largely determined and sustained in the hegemonic training of student bodies in school spaces. The school space is an essential space where power relations work upon and train youth-student-bodies to be productive and submissive in their adult endeavours.

Many of Foucault's architectural examples are school spaces, which makes his study especially useful in the consideration of their representations in school stories. Foucault considers systems of discipline that aim to order and structure physical space to render bodies useful, subjected, and productive. Foucault argues that specific forms of architecture, such as school spaces, develop with the intention of

> transform[ing] individuals: to act on those it shelters, to provide a hold on their conduct, to carry the effects of power right to them, to make it possible to know them, to alter them. Stones can make people docile and knowable. (172)

The school space, like the prison or military training camp, is concerned with the transformation of bodies into specific productive types that will be useful to the governing powers in the sustainability and expansion of their power. Foucault claims that bodies are made docile by architecture through various disciplinary tactics that structure space, such as the distribution of bodies in enclosed space through the organization and partition of bodies; the control of activities within the space through segmentation and the hierarchizing of time; and continual surveillance and examination that always "compares, differentiates, hierarchizes, homogenizes, [and] excludes" bodies (182-3). Within the following chapters, I compare the architectural space Foucault outlines, as well as the practices that the spatial codes dictate on the student bodies to those described and illustrated in school stories.

Foucault considers the surveillance of Jeremy Bentham's architectural prison design, the Panopticon, and how the intentions behind this structure influence most of the school spaces considered in this study. Bentham's Panopticon is a circular building broken into separate compartments on the periphery, with a tower situated in the centre. Each compartment contains a window which provides the inmate a view of the tower. In the tower is installed an observer, and with the effect of backlighting, the inmates are conscious of their surveillance but unable to see the details of their observer. The knowledge gained from the continual observance of the inmates' bodies ensures the continued power of the observer, and the inmates' consciousness of their "permanent visibility" assures the "automatic functioning of power" (201). Because of the backlighting of the observer, the inmates see the outline of the tower but never know whether they are actually being watched in any moment; the inmate knows he or she may be "always looked at at any one moment" (201). Inmates control and manipulate their actions as if they are always being watched by the observer, and this enables the functioning of power to be exercised over the inmate bodies at all times, thus training and disciplining their bodies.

The idea behind the Panopticon structures many of the school spaces, but rather than the architectural design solely making students observable at any moment, it is a combination of architecture and the disciplinary methods that the architecture enables that Foucault details that work in conjunction to make student bodies observable in any moment. Adult power is continually exercised over student bodies as they are made knowable through the panoptic surveillance methods. Though the disciplinary structures that organize the physical school space that shift with time, such as the prefect and monitorial systems being replaced with less formal bullying relationships and closed-captioned cameras, student bodies are always observable and

malleable, controlling their actions to please the judging surveilling gaze, and with this repeated practice student bodies are transformed into docile and productive bodies.

Henry A. Giroux argues that the observations Foucault makes on the institutions of the past and his (Foucault's) present have continued to manifest, and indeed proliferate, with the rise of neoliberalism. Giroux observes that schools always have, and will be, political spaces because they produce "particular kinds of agents, desires, and social relations" (172), but that neoliberalism creates a culture of cruelty that transforms the school space into a "market to be commodified, privatized, and surrendered to the demands of capital" (*Education* 13). In the "name of educational reform, reason is gutted of its critical potential and reduced to a deadening pedagogy of . . . classroom practices that celebrate mindless repetition and conformity" (*Education* 162). Giroux emphasises that critical pedagogy, whose aim is to educate students to become critical agents who can "actively question" (*Education* 120), is seen as threatening to the hegemony of neoliberalism because "critical education cultivates students who value collective well-bring, examine public issues, lead rather than follow, embrace reasoned arguments over opinions, and reject narrow conceptions of common sense as the engine of truth" (*Education* 120). In other words, a critical pedagogy does not create docile bodies trained by the school space to abide hegemony's power uncritically.

Space as Physical, Ideological, and Symbolic Reality

My initial understanding of architectural space and its relationship to power and society relies upon Henri Lefebvre's pivotal text *The Production of Space* (1974). Lefebvre's work was innovative in the effort to rethink the production of space as an "entanglement between power and knowledge" (Stanek x), which we see Foucault continuing in his examination of disciplinary

space. Łukasz Stanek breaks down Lefebvre's inventive body of work into three primary theoretical decisions: the shift of focus from space to its production; to embrace the multiplicity of social practices that produces space and makes it "socially productive"; and a focus on the "contradictory, conflictual, and, ultimately, political character of the processes of production of space" (Stanek ix). Cultural hegemony (what Foucault calls "power relations") is essential in the apprehension of space's production, and Lefebvre argues that hegemony is exercised over society as a whole: over ideals and institutions. If "capitalism" is understood as "hegemonic," space is produced under this hegemony's systems of production and will "embody its values as the cultural dominant, resulting in 'hegemonic-space'" (Coleman 60). Following Foucault's assertions of how architectural space acts upon bodies, the disciplinary structures supported by the space are shaped by the hegemonic systems of productions, and the student bodies will be marked and moulded by the specific hegemonic values. The concept of hegemonic space supports the assertion that school stories are time capsules: if space embodies the values of the hegemony/power relations, and school stories are representations of school spaces that embody the values and ideologies of the cultural dominant, it follows that school stories will likewise be shaped by the hegemony. Further, if the moral education and character development of students is determined by what production of bodies is valued by the hegemony, school stories offer insight into the shifting historical conceptions of childhood and youth and their roles in the production of society.

Those in positions of power seek to maintain their hegemony by any means, and knowledge is one method of maintaining power. It is inconceivable to Lefebvre that the exercise of hegemony would touch all of society but leave "space untouched" (11). He states it is the active "role of space, as knowledge and action" that aids in sustaining a ruling power's

hegemony through the power of knowledge (11). Architectural spaces have spatial codes, systems that make space legible to those within the culture that produced it (Coleman 72), put in place by the hegemonies that construct spaces and restrict bodies' activities within spaces: "space 'decides' what activity may occur . . . [and] space commands bodies, prescribing or proscribing gestures, routes and distances to be covered" (Lefebvre 143). To uncover spatial codes is not an inherently transparent process, for spaces are not produced by the ruling systems to be easily comprehended by the bodies living in the space. Lefebvre insists that space is "designed to conceal" its power over the body (147), and is a covert carrier and communicator of dominant ideological values to those inhabiting the space (Coleman 61).

The disciplinary panoptic gaze Foucault describes casts observed bodies as passively accepting their being made docile; however, Foucault also contends that "where there is power, there is resistance" and that "points of resistance are present everywhere in the power network" (*History* 95). Lefebvre speaks to this resistance in his argument that bodies need not live passively within hegemonically-produced spaces. Studies on dwelling practices in 1960s and 1970s France, specifically in the *pavillon* (detached home), led Lefebvre to believe the production of space is not limited to the creators of space (the city planners, architects, bureaucrats, government administrators), but is also produced in the everyday practices of the "inhabitants" and "users." For bodies to inhabit a space "is to appropriate something. Not in the sense of possessing it, but as making it an oeuvre, making it one's own, marking it, modeling it, shaping it" (Lefebvre qtd. in Shanek 87). Even in the "midst of constraints" of ruling powers' attempts to control the actions and movements of bodies, to inhabit space "is to be in a conflict—often acute—between the constraining powers and the forces of appropriation" (Lefebvre qtd. in Shanek 42). For Lefebvre, appropriation involves the varied practices of individuals or

collectives in space that "modify, reshape, adapt, adjust, or alter space on various scales," whether it be a corner of one's private dwelling or in the "urban territory" (Stanek, 88). Small or large appropriation, the inhabitants of space make "meaningful choices" in how they inhabit the space, whether that be to be made docile or to resist this (Stanek, 90).

Inspired by a study conducted by Philippe Boudon on the forty-year-old Pessac neighbourhood that compared the original architectural plans to the substantial alterations made by those living in the community, Lefebvre mused,

> Instead of installing themselves in their containers, instead of adapting to them and living in them "passively," they decided that as far as possible they were going to live "actively" . . . they took what had been offered them and worked on it, converted it, added to it. (Preface)

To further illustrate the notion of living actively by appropriating a space, we can consider the home office. Rather than a spatially coded bedroom that is converted into a work space, it has become common for producers (architects, builders, and so on) to include space that is coded specifically as a home office in domestic dwellings. Often, a room directly adjacent to the home's entrance is coded as a home office with such architectural markers as glass doors, floor to ceiling bookcases, built-in desks, and easy access to the front door so as to welcome clients but keep them separate from the private dwelling. This room is produced by the ideologies and values of capitalism and neo-liberalism: the space blurs the boundaries between work and leisure, domestic and professional life, and endorses more productive hours under the guise of making work life more conveniently accessed. However, every user must not passively accept and use the home office as the spatial codes suggest and may live actively by converting and appropriating the space in ways that run counter to its codes. For example, I have personally

witnessed these spatially coded home offices converted into playrooms for children, an art studio for a hobbyist painter, a home movie theatre, and storage space. Lefebvre's theories of space's production uncover the constraints hegemonic powers insert into spaces, such as the home office extending a widening gap in work/life balance to increase bodies' productivity, but it affords the activity of space's inhabitants to appropriate the space in their lived experience. The same can be said of students, and in school stories that feature oppressive school environments I explore in the following chapters the distinct methods with which protagonists live actively in their school spaces, which often takes the form of rebellion.

Michel de Certeau's *The Practice of Everyday Life* (1984) intervenes in Foucault's concepts in the exploration of the everyday practices of individuals and entire societies that function as rebellions, resistances, and subversions of disciplinary panoptic spaces. De Certeau engages directly with Foucault's theories regarding space and agrees "the grid of 'discipline' is everywhere" (xiv), but rather than bodies in space being "passive and guided by established rules" (xi), there are means of resisting and manipulating "the mechanisms of discipline and conform to them only in order to evade them" (xiv). De Certeau argues there are "innumerable practices by which means users reappropriate the space organized by techniques of sociocultural production" (xiv), and his study illuminates the methods of "dispersed, tactical, and makeshift creativity of groups of individuals already caught in the nets of 'discipline'" (xiv-xv). Much like Lefebvre, de Certeau sees that through reappropriation and manipulation of physical space individuals and groups can resist the grid of discipline, and when "pushed to the limits, these procedures and ruses . . . compose the network of an antidiscipline" (xv). De Certeau's arguments reveal that space, while structured to support the dominance of those in power, has the potential to be manipulated and transformed by those who are dominated. In my study, the

school stories that feature spaces that facilitate oppressive disciplinary structures demonstrate the ability of individuals and/or groups to manipulate mechanisms of discipline to evade them and, to extend de Certeau's arguments, revolutionize and reform them.

In *The Practice of Everyday Life*, de Certeau distinguishes between "strategies" and "tactics," and their opposition to one another. De Certeau uses "strategies" to represent institutions (governments, armies, corporations, educational institutions, and so forth) which "produce" the structures of power: "[S]trategies are actions which, thanks to the establishment of a place of power . . . elaborate theoretical places . . . capable of articulating an ensemble of physical places" (38). Individuals are the "consumers" who obey the laws of place enforced by "producers" through their "strategies." Consumers can adapt to the space through "tactics," which removes the passivity of the consumers and acknowledges their agency. To demonstrate his argument, de Certeau uses the example of an individual walking through a city. Cities are created by strategies of institutional power, such as governments and corporations; they build the physical elements of the city, as well as tools like maps that "seek to create places in conformity with abstract models" (29). Like the home office, city planners and developers imagine and attempt to control movement and action in the city through their creations of paths and roads; however, the producers cannot fathom or fully control how consumers will use the roads and paths. Some "consumers" walking the streets do not necessarily accept the disciplinary grid but, as Lefebvre would say, live actively by "mov[ing] them about and he invents others, since the crossing, drifting away, or improvisation of walking privilege, transform or abandon spatial elements" (de Certeau 98). The pedestrian who cuts through an alley or across a park with no footpath, or walks a path designated for bicycle traffic only, is an example of a consumer using the producers' space creatively. De Certeau compares the individual walking city streets to

Charlie Chaplin manipulating the possible uses for his cane: "[H]e does other things with the same thing and he goes beyond the limits that the determinants of the object set on its utilization" (98). While both Lefebvre's and de Certeau's arguments agree with Foucault's assertion that society has been built like a panopticon (de Certeau uses the city skyscraper as an example of making the many observable to the few), their theories more fully explore how some individuals' actions, choices, and use of space can resist, subvert, and transform the disciplinary grid and even create a space of anti-discipline. This study examines the creative ways fictional students employ tactics to live actively in their oppressive school spaces, and I argue that their active living functions as a form of agency, resistance, and rebellion to the net of discipline sustained by the architectural space.

De Certeau's theories are useful not only in the complication and enrichment of Foucault's arguments, but his arguments translate the act/tactic of reading school stories as a potential method of resistance. According to de Certeau, reading can constitute an everyday practice of consumers' resistance that produces without capitalizing (xx). Reading would seem to comprise an optimal act of passivity in which the consumer is "conceived as a voyeur" (xxi), and socialized by producers through the texts' giving form to social practices (166). In actuality, reading functions as a "silent production" that de Certeau compares to renting a room, poaching, and travelling (xx). He describes the practice of reading as such:

> [T]he [eyes] drift across the page, the metamorphosis of the text effected by the wandering eyes of the reader, the improvisation and expectation of means inferred from a few words, leaps over written spaces in an ephemeral dance. . . . He insinuates into another person's text the ruses of pleasure and appropriation: he poaches on it, is transported into it, pluralizes himself. (xxi)

A reader "invents in texts something different from what they [producers] intended," and the act of reading "combines . . . fragments and creates something un-known in the space organized by their capacity for allowing an indefinite plurality of meanings" (169). Reading in this creative way has been socially authorized to professionals (traditionally clergy and teachers) and intellectuals, and denied to students, "who are scornfully driven or cleverly coaxed back to the meaning 'accepted' by their teachers" (172). Since the Reformation, which diminished the Church's control over the written world, reading has become a fundamental aspect of consumption in a society that is "increasingly written" (167), and the "creativity of readers grows as the institutions that controlled it declines" (172), it has become impossible for those in power to fully control readers. This opens innumerable possibilities in children's and youths' reading of school stories and casts their reading as a profoundly political act that resists the disciplinary structures of society as Foucault describes. Children and youth can engage with texts, such as those explored in this study, that encourage them to move creatively and actively in the spaces of their societies to evade and transform power structures that cast them as the "weak" and "dominated." Using the ideas of Foucault, Lefebvre, and de Certeau together allows me to examine how school spaces are constructed and ruled by hegemonic powers, how the spaces created by hegemonic powers act upon the bodies of those living within them, but also how inhabitants inspired by their reading can live actively to appropriate and poach the spaces in radical and progressive ways.

Affect Theory

The architectural spaces presented in school stories, that are like those described by Foucault in their practices, works upon student bodies to produce a certain affective response. Affect theory,

in its simplest form of explanation, is the study of emotions. Theorists of affect believe that humans are "inherently social, connected to each other and larger collectivities by innumerable feelings" (Flam 1), and that emotions are "part of the relations and interactions between humans rather than an individual or internal phenomenon" (Zembylas 181). A stream within affect theory seeks to understand the spatiality of emotions and how affect is linked to humans' interactions with space. Joyce Davidson et al. explain that those who examine the spatiality of emotions, or emotional geographies, attempt "to understand emotion—experimentally and conceptually—in terms of its socio-spatial mediation and articulation rather than as entirely interiorized subjective mental states" (3). These studies emphasize that emotions are intricately linked to space and context. Combining a study of space with affect theory enables exploration into how the spatial codes that place restrictions upon bodies elicit particular affective responses in student characters represented in fictional texts. Texts can construct an ethos about school spaces that attempts to transmit to readers how they should *feel* about their own school experience. The ethos of the Golden Age school story transmits feelings of loyalty and pride in the school space, and the oppressive school stories convey feelings of distrust, anger, and revolutionary attitudes.

A key figure in the developing field of affect, Sara Ahmed, examines texts and their emotionality in her pivotal work *The Cultural Politics of Emotion* (2004).[9] Ahmed offers close readings of texts with attention to the use of metaphor and metonymy to suggest that "'figures of speech' are crucial to the emotionality of texts . . . [and] the emotionality of texts is one way of describing how texts are 'moving', or how they generate effects" (12-13).[10] Rather than

---

[9] Ahmed uses a variety of texts to explore different emotions that all circulate in the public domain: websites, government reports, political speeches, and newspaper articles.

[10] "Emotionality" is a term used by Sara Ahmed to describe how "figures of speech" in texts stick to bodies, or how they "generate effects" (*Cultural* 13). Put differently: reference to a text's emotionality refers to the words used to describe and generate feelings in that text.

discussing emotions as being within texts, Ahmed argues emotion is an effect "of the very naming of emotions" (13), and she suggests that an effect of the emotionality of narratives is that they literally impress upon bodies (stick to bodies) and change their surfaces. A character's feeling of pride in his or her school, or disgust and anger, can stick to and impress upon readers' bodies to influence their own affective responses to institutionalized education. In relation to de Certeau's arguments concerning reading, the specific emotionality of texts ties affect to space and context, and readers can appropriate the emotionality expressed in texts in significant and revolutionary ways through the impression upon their bodies and by turning affect into action. Helmut Kuzmics argues that literary narratives describe and explain the world around us and come quite close to the complexities of real life situations (25 and 34), and thus

> emotions can be depicted in descriptions of all channels through which they are mediated: expressed affects via mimics, gestures, body language, sounds, smells and so on. Furthermore, we have descriptions and dialogues referring to 'inner states' that can also be rendered in self-reports of the main actors. (33)

Examining affective representations of students within literature provides the opportunity to explore, as Ahmed describes, how through the emotionality of texts, emotions "circulate between bodies" (4), and "work to shape the 'surface' of individual and collective bodies" (1), allowing me to posit about the possible effects of these texts upon implied readers, or what effects the surface ideologies invite readers to feel.

Which School Stories are Considered: Outline of Project

To limit my scope, this study examines English language children's and YA school stories set in England, the United States, and Canada. There are inherit tensions in examining three

geographical locations side by side that have separate (though, sometimes intersecting) histories—especially their distinctive histories of colonization, immigration, and treatment of Indigenous peoples– systems of government, economic, national, foreign, and defense policies, and so forth. Each nation contains its own amalgamation of cultural, ethnic, and religious diversities. [11] The historical and current practices of how and why various groups came to each nation, and the prejudicial treatment of particular distinct groups, are distinct to each country. This study does not consider these three countries together to collapse their difference, but finds that the depictions of school space, both architectural and social, that originate from these three nations share remarkable similarities. School stories from Canada and the United States often directly address and expand upon the school story subgenre that was established in Britain. The school story subgenre proper was born in Britain and was a product of Victorian education developments (Auchmuty, "School Stories"). The subgenre initially spread to Commonwealth countries as part of Britain's imperialistic agenda when school stories were "freely distributed and sometimes reprinted in local editions" (Auchmuty, "School Stories"), and led Commonwealth countries and former colonies to produce their own school stories. In Canada, reprinted British public-school stories were an educational tool employed by Britain to socialize young Canadians to think of their country's present and future values and power structures in ways that fostered obedience and loyalty to Britain.

Golden Age public-school stories were also exported to the United States, but with a very different outcome. The United States began to produce its own school stories that used the structures and conventions of British public-school stories, but in a way that distanced them from

[11] The school story subgenre struggles to accurately represent the diversities of each nation. Even with some movement and momentum towards more diverse representations in the twenty-first century, the subgenre is historically predicated on representations of white characters.

British values to create a distinctly "American" identity. Take for example Susan Coolidge's *What Katy did at School* (1873). Katy's father is convinced by an aunt that an all-girls boarding school would be beneficial to his motherless daughters, and Katy's father, though he "hates to part from [them]" (26), reluctantly sends his daughters to the school. The school does not live up to any of Katy's expectations: the buildings are shabby, the students are vain, and the teachers are cruel. In the concluding chapter, "Paradise Regained," the father is reunited with his daughters, and he decides not to send them back to the school: "No, he could never spare them again, for boarding school or anything else" (154). The novel debunks the prestige and allure of boarding schools that the public-school ethos had transmitted, and subtly characterizes the British as cold and unfeeling in their elected family separations. Katy's independence, shown in her ability to remain aloof from her corrupt peers, and her family's unity is emphasized in direct contrast to the British public-school stories.

The study is separated into six chapters, and each chapter considers a group of school stories that deal with a similar subject matter or theme: Golden Age public-school stories, youth-authored World War I school stories, Indigenous-authored picture books about Canadian residential schools, lethal violence school stories, YA dystopian school stories, and *Harry Potter* and magical education. Organizing chapters around a theme, movement, or historical period enables the examination of oppressive school spaces in school stories over a broad time period. Consequently, this organization made it difficult to include some individual works that did not fit with a themes or clusters.[12]

[12] Although they were significant texts during my research, works like Robert Cormier's *The Chocolate War* (1974), its sequel *Beyond the Chocolate War* (1985), John Knowles's *A Separate Peace* (1959), and its sequel *Peace Breaks Out* (1981) functioned as digressions rather than rational extensions within the clusters. As such, an examination of the relation between school

Fredric Jameson argues that to understand literary genres we must first delineate the features of a genre to "map our coordinates on the basis of those fixed stars and to triangulate these specific given textual movements" (*Political* 322). To best map the "given textual movements" of subversive school stories, Chapter One examines the conservative "fixed stars" of Golden Age public-school stories to establish a baseline of school story conventions and representations of space against which to measure later generic departures. Fixated on the moral education and character development of students so as to make them productive adult citizens, the disciplinary structures represented in public-school stories encourage the safe rebellions of students to test the boundaries of authority and learn to respect the hierarchical power relations that engulf them.

Chapter Two engages with an early disruption in the idyllic representation of the moral education of public schools in the consideration of four youth-authored school stories. The four young authors claim authority over the public-school space which destabilizes the hierarchical youth-adult relationships in school spaces and British society. The authors each claim theirs as the first authentic accounts of public-school life, and this discredits the adult-authored school stories that came before. The texts question the ideological structures of public schools in the light of their consequences during World War I, and through the everyday practice of reading and engaging in critical thought, these youth reconsider their school spaces and imagine reforms to reconstruct the space into the ideal representation in Golden Age school stories. These texts represent a significant and singular moment in the genre in which young adults took control of the representations of their own experiences and imagined reforms to institutional school space.

---

space and student bodies in these texts will be better served in individual studies outside of this dissertation.

Chapter Three considers a group of picturebooks about Canadian residential schools. The group intervenes in the conservative, colonial, and imperialist roots of the school story subgenre to challenge the representation of historical residential school spaces through their depictions of protagonists who are triumphant in resisting the oppressive effects of the school. Using Dominick LaCapra's concept of "empathic unsettlement" and Gerald Vizenor's notion of "survivance" (the combination of resistance and survival) I argue that these picturebooks begin to "restory" the master settler narratives regarding residential schools and their legacy. Non-Indigenous readers may be unsettled in the understanding that the ability to live where and how we do within Canada has been made possible by the cultural genocide of the residential schools. Indigenous readers may be unsettled from internalized prejudice that is born and sustained by the pedagogy of the residential schools, and empowered in witnessing the resilience of protagonists' triumphs against the residential school space. Reading practices that restory the nation implicates young readers in the project of reconciliation of settler Canadians and Indigenous peoples.

Chapter Four examines what I term YA lethal violence school stories that endorse empathetic readings. I engage with the arguments of Stanley Aronowitz and Julia Webber that rampage school shootings are evidence of the failure of the democratic nonviolence social contract. The novels depict perpetrators of lethal school violence as "Exiters": those who choose to opt-out of participation in the nonviolence contract. Through the violent "exits" of characters, the perpetrators of lethal school violence briefly rearrange the power structures of their school spaces and claim authority over the spaces with their violence. Characterized as dark and political rebellions, these exits do not offer an alternative to the school structures that had oppressed the perpetrators, but rather perpetuate structures that ensure domination of one over another. YA lethal violence novels consider the "homogenous social" of the school space and

implicate readers in creating similar atmospheres within their own schools by either engaging in bullying behaviour or acting as bystanders to bullying practices. The texts shift responsibility for ending school violence to implied readers. The novels do not fully consider how the homogenous social structures of schools are connected to, and informed by, larger systemic issues such as gun laws, mental health stigmas, access to health care, family history, and neoliberal values that encourage aggression and violence. Adult society is relieved of culpability, and the novels situate bullying and school violence as "youth problems" rather than as symptoms of the larger neoliberal "adult" society.

Where Chapter Four represents neoliberal dystopic school spaces that are "zones of social abandonment" (Giroux, "Killing Children"), Chapter Five considers dystopian school stories that position schools as existing within the intersection of pedagogy, politics, economics, and power. In YA dystopian school stories, surveillance technologies are inserted into the spatial properties of the schools to construct highly oppressive environments in which adults control students' bodies. Using S. Mann et al.'s concept of "sousveillance," I argue that characters rebel, resist, evade, and overpower the pervasive surveillance systems to equalize the disparity in knowledge between youth and adults. The success and quality of characters' rebellions varies in each text: some engage in sousveillance that utilizes the tactics of their oppressors, and others do not offer real alternatives to previous governing power structures of their societies. Regardless of the rebellions' quality, the texts represent youth characters as politically engaged and capable of reforming their oppressive governing states. The texts position sousveillance and political engagement as the responsibility of student characters, for to do nothing entails furthering and strengthening the structures that manipulated and oppressed them as students.

The final chapter considers J. K. Rowling's *Harry Potter* series as a return to, and expansion of, Victorian ideologies and values. Students receive their moral education from rule-breaking at Hogwarts, and learn to respect, obey, and *defend* morally just leaders and governing structures. Rowling extends the moral education of British public schools with the addition of it being considered students' right and responsibility to defend morally just systems, as modelled to them through the leadership of Headmaster Dumbledore at Hogwarts. Characters defend the structures of Hogwarts from an internal (to the magical world) threat, Lord Voldemort, and their rebellion is conservative in that they seek to restore previous systems that are rooted in nineteenth-century conceptions of gender, sexuality, and race. However, readers surpass the conservative values of Hogwarts in their emulation of Harry's social engagement and activism. I examine the March for Our Lives movement as one example of youth internalizing Harry's moral education to seek progressive and liberal change in reformed gun laws. *Harry Potter* offers a repetition and return of the Golden Age public school space; however, the ethos of the represented school space communicates revolutionary attitudes to readers that encourage active citizenship rather than blind obedience to governing structures.

The study concludes with a consideration of the ways many of the texts considered in the study, through the ordinary and everyday practice of reading modelled in Chapter Two, help young readers to develop sophisticated understandings on the complexities of social organization. In their characters' rebellions against the discipline structures their school spaces enable, the texts communicate the importance of young people being integrated into political life and position young people as capable of remaking society (Hintz 263). The study ends with a brief consideration of an American elementary student who was her school's solitary participant in the national student walkout on 14 March 2018 organized by the March of Our Lives youth-

run organization. This young student/activist demonstrates that she sees it as her right and responsibility to push against the structures that organize, influence, and direct her life, especially the structures of her school. School stories have the potential to be the narratives which inspire and give narrative form to these awakenings (as they do in Chapters Two, Three, Five, and Six), or they continue to function in the conservative Golden Age hue that cajoles children and youth to be unquestioningly obedient and loyal to (adult) governing structures. The majority of texts in this study feature oppressive school spaces not to depict the inescapable nature of oppressive structures, but rather to show oppressive school spaces as capable of being radically transformed by students.

Chapter One

Safe Rebellions in British Public-School Stories

The Golden Age of the school story subgenre took place in Britain from the middle of the nineteenth century to the middle of the twentieth century. The stories were primarily set in British public schools, exclusive institutions that charged high tuition to socialize Britain's elite children and youth into adults obedient and loyal to the Crown and Empire. Henri Lefebvre contends that space is produced under hegemony's systems of production, and this hegemonic space embodies the values of the culturally dominant society (38). Public-school spaces are hegemonic spaces produced during nineteenth-century Britain's economic and imperialistic expansions, and the schools impressed upon students "virtues such as ambition and initiative, discipline and team spirit, readiness to take up responsibility, and a talent for leadership" (Petzold 17). Public school was considered the ideal space that offered the best pedagogy to instil these desirable virtues into children and youth, and this transformed public schools into "highly prestigious and efficient production plants for the nation's elite" (Petzold 17). The "chivalric ethos" of public-school students informed a "new code of colonial conduct" that distinguished and elevated the British from the people they ruled over and sought to conquer (Barczewski 220).

The popularity of public-school stories is linked to the rise of public schools themselves in Britain, and the stories represented the hegemonic space of public schools. The vast majority of public-school stories explicitly endorses the imperial and colonial values of nineteenth-century Britain (otherwise known as the surface ideologies of the texts), and in their endorsement they recommend that readers embody these values. The British process of nationalization was accelerated in the nineteenth century, and Rebecca Knuth argues, "[N]ational ideas were

embedded in stories that helped unify the population into a nation" (6) in which "[i]deological Englishness enshrined obedience, racial pride, and heroism for its own sake. Duty to country and empire was a sacred obligation" (11). If duty to country was sacred, the public-school space and the stories about public schools were temples that instilled the sense of the sacred in students, fictional characters, and readers. Isabel Quigly notes that public-school stories, though fictional, were regarded as fact by the reading public and "came to influence life in a way few novels have managed to do" (49). Dieter Petzold expands on this, and he argues that "from the very beginning, school stories did not simply describe life at boarding schools; they also formulated and propagated the educational aims of these institutions and thus contributed to the very development of the institutions they claimed to describe" (17). Both schools and stories endorsed the values of obedience and loyalty to youth, and these virtues were indistinguishable from the idea of "Englishness." Public-school stories were agents of socialization, capable of transmitting important imperialist virtues and values to readers, including to those who would never attend public school themselves.

Affect studies provides a useful lens to posit how the values of the culturally dominant nineteenth-century British society that were embedded within the surface ideologies of public-school stories were transmitted to, or impressed upon, readers through both the representation of public-schools' education and the practice of reading. Melissa Gregg and Gregory J. Seigworth define "affect" as the "force encounters" with objects and/or people that pass between bodies, and the "body's capacity to be affect and to be affected" by these force encounters (2). Affect scholars are interested in how a body, marked by various force encounters, comes "to shift its affects (its being-affected) into action (capacity to affect)" (Gregg and Seigworth 2). Sara Ahmed argues that education is a force encounter that impresses upon bodies with the intention of

orienting subjects to "face the right way such that they can receive the right impressions" (*Happiness* 54). Education is the "art of orientation" and operates under the assumption that "the would-be subject is improperly aligned," and thus the subject is "directed not only by being turned around but by being turned 'the right way' around" (*Happiness* 54). This is certainly true of public-school story characters who are oriented away from "childish" individualism towards communal nationalism through the moral education provided at school.

Reading is another force encounter that can impress upon readers' bodies much as education does. Reading is a force encounter that has the potential for an object (the school story) to impress upon readers' bodies in an encounter that mobilizes, produces, and shapes emotions (Davidson et al. 10). According to Ahmed, objects such as texts can impress upon bodies through force encounters in which the body can "take the shape of the very contact they have with objects . . . aligning subjects with collectives" (*Cultural* 1). There is the possibility for readers to be "aligned" or "orientated" in a specific direction through the process of their reading. School stories are textual objects that can mobilize readers in particular directions and push emotions stimulated through reading (such as national pride) into embodied action (being loyal and obedient to governing power structures). In the case of school stories, reader "alignment" or "orientation" remains the goal as reading about a school is itself a school (Clark 7).

The objective of this chapter is twofold: to establish the traditional representations of British imperial and colonial hegemonically produced architectural school spaces and their afforded disciplinary structures to determine a baseline of convention against which to measure deviations in the subgenre; and to argue that the conventional disciplinary structures of Golden Age school stories afford and encourage student rebellions that are made "safe" in their

validation of the culturally dominant British colonial society. Safe rebellions are imperative to student characters' experimentation with the boundaries of power and authority before they become fully appreciative of, and participatory in, the power structures of their schools and the national British macrocosm that produces the disciplinary structures of the school space. The chapter will also show how characters develop the virtues of obedience and loyalty, and how the act of reading can impress these surface ideologies upon readers' bodies to encourage emulation of these virtues and to ensure that the intended national socialization processes of public schools are disseminated beyond their elite students.

The chapter is organized into three sections that progressively move through the macro- to micro-representations of the public-school's architectural space and their disciplinary structures in public-school stories. Thomas Hughes's *Tom Brown's Schooldays* (1857) guides the first section, and an analysis of Tom's early childhood and his journey to Rugby School provides the narrative blueprint most often repeated during the Golden Age of school stories. The second section moves with Tom inside the walls of public schools and investigates the representation of the space's disciplinary structures that are afford by the physical construction of the space. Through methods of partitions and rank, students' movements and relationships are controlled and manipulated by the architectural and symbolic organization of the enclosed school space. The third section examines student characters' safe rebellions. The rebellions are approved byproducts of the represented disciplinary structures: they endorse the power structures that order the schools, and they foster the national virtues of loyalty and obedience. All three sections establish the generic conventions that structure Golden Age school stories and that continue to function as the bedrock of the subgenre. Outlining these conventions makes it possible to

comprehend more fully how school stories with oppressive school spaces engage with the same conventions but represent rebellions that challenge and seek to reform school spaces.

Student Life Before Public School

"Proud to be a Rugby Boy"

Thomas Hughes's *Tom Brown's Schooldays* (1857) is not the first children's novel set in a school, but it is hailed by many as the originator of the school story *subgenre* (Honey; Quigly; Musgrave; Richards; Nelson).[13] The prefect system, fagging, cribbing,[14] athleticism, telling tales,[15] midnight feasts, and the awe-inspiring Headmaster/mistress are all repeated school story conventions that were first made popular by Hughes. Robert Kirkpatrick argues that *Tom Brown* "consolidate[d] the foundations of the public-school story and . . . popularize[d] the genre as a whole, by virtue of its extensive and almost universal favourable critical reception" (2). Hughes wrote the novel to prepare his own son for his impending departure to Rugby School in Warwickshire, England. *Tom Brown* acted as a guide for Hughes's son about what to expect at

---

[13] Sarah Fielding's *The Governess* (1749) is the first piece of children's literature to be set entirely in a school. Other notable, but by no means exhaustive, examples that pre-date *Tom Brown* include: Richard *Johnson's The Little Female Orators; or, Nine Evenings Entertainment* (1770); Dorthy Kilner's *First Going to School; of, The Story of Tom Brown, and his Sisters* (1804); and Harriett Martineau *The Crofton Boys: A Tale* (1841).

[14] Cribs are a translation of a text written in a foreign language, or commentaries of English written works. "Cribbing" is the verb for using translations and commentaries. Commonly, conflict arises when a crib is found, an innocent student is accused of using one, and eventually the guilty party steps forward with a humbled heart ready to accept punishment.

[15] "Telling tales" can refer both to lying and reporting problems between students to a teacher or Headmaster. To involve adults in student confrontations is looked down upon by students and teachers alike. Students are expected to resolve conflicts on their own. "Telling tales" can also refer to telling what happens at school to an outsider, which is also frowned upon. In E. J. May's *Louis's School Days* (1852), Louis gossips with ladies about his school peers, and the act comes back to haunt him when a new student enrols in the school who has overheard the gossip and tells the other students what Louis said. It is a lesson against gossip, but also in being completely loyal to one's school and student body.

Rugby, and the novel came to inform the expectations of countless schoolboys and girls regarding public schools and the stories about them. Drawing heavily from his own education at Rugby (he attended from 1834-1842), Hughes's representation of Rugby is idealized and nostalgic, especially in the depiction of his beloved Headmaster, Doctor Thomas Arnold. *Tom Brown* set the standard for public-school stories as most Golden Age authors followed the formulaic blueprint established by Hughes and his representation of the school space.

The novel is set in the 1830s and follows the protagonist, Tom Brown, from his early childhood education at a village day school to his years at Rugby. Tom is an ordinary boy, though he is a member of the gentry class. The novel opens with the narrator explaining, "The Browns have become illustrious by the pen of Thackeray" (1), which is a reference to William Makepeace Thackeray's series of articles entitled "Mr. Brown's Letters to a Young Man about Town" (1849). In this series of articles, Thackeray had taken the name "Brown" to be representative of the everyman, or the ordinary Englishman. Thus, Tom's surname signals his status as a representative of the ordinary Englishman, a designation countless school story characters share with him. During his years at Rugby, Tom forms close friendships (with Harry East and George Arthur) that aid in his moral education; stages a campaign to end the bullying of the school tyrant, Flash; learns to fight the temptation to crib, drink, and smoke; plays in seemingly countless games of football; and deepens his spirituality through listening to the awe-inspiring sermons of Headmaster Arnold. From these experiences and more, Tom undergoes moral growth and is moulded into a responsible adult. Tom returns to Rugby as an adult at the close of the novel to pay his respects to Headmaster Arnold, who had recently died. Deeply grieved, Tom reflects on his beloved eight years at Rugby, and the narrator provides readers their last look at a mature Tom as he mourns his Headmaster at the altar of the school chapel where he

feels "the drawing of the bond which links all living souls together in one brotherhood" (376). Tom's grief demonstrates his sustained, deep attachment not just to Arnold, but to the space in which Arnold socialized Tom.

Early Childhood Sections

Tom Brown does not begin at Rugby School, but rather, like the stories that followed, starts with an account of Tom's early childhood to establish his social situation and raw character. Ahmed's argument that education operates under the assumption that students are initially improperly aligned is illustrated in the early childhood sections, as protagonists are often represented as unknowledgeable, lacking moral and spiritual depth, and not yet embodying the chivalric "British" virtues of selflessness, bravery, and leadership. When readers witness protagonists' behaviour prior to their public-school socialization process, they are provided a baseline against which to measure characters' development. Before his Rugby education, Tom is "a robust and combative urchin" (22), and his wild nature is indicated when he plays and socializes with the village children and household servants (24-43, 58-60). Later, public-school stories frequently did away with these sections, and popular authors like Talbot Baines Reed, Harold Avery, Gunby Hadath, Dorita Fairlie Bruce, Winifred Darch, and Enid Blyton regularly begin their school stories *in medias res.*[16] These authors may not have included early childhood sections

[16] Early childhood sections, or a section involving the journey to school with the protagonist's family, have not completely disappeared from school stories. Recent school stories that take place at boarding schools often begin with a section showing the protagonists with their family to establish their social situation, and to provide an early character description so the outcome of their socialization is more pronounced. For example, J.K. Rowling's *Harry Potter* series includes an early childhood section reminiscent of *Tom Brown* in that Tom and Harry are finally surrounded by their "own sort" upon entry into their elite boarding schools. Two American YA novels, John Green's *Looking for Alaska* (2005) and Meg Wolitzer's *Belzhar* (2014), both include opening chapters that provide an explanation for why these American teenagers are

because of readers' expectations that the protagonists' social backgrounds and early character traits would be similar to those of well-established public-school stories.

Alongside the primary descriptions of characters, the early childhood sections detail why parents send their children to public schools. On the eve of Tom's departure, Squire Brown ponders why he is sending his son to Rugby and reasons it is not for the academics ("I don't care a straw for Greek particles" [78]), but for the moral education Tom needs to "turn out a brave, helpful, truth-telling Englishman, and a gentleman, and a Christian" (78). Nationhood is emphasized in the desire for Tom to grow into an "Englishman," and the characteristics of being brave, loyal, obedient, and Christian are fused with Squire Brown's conception of Englishness. These characteristics, which Squire Brown believes Rugby will instil in his son, are imagined as the best preparation for Tom's future adult position as a member of Britain's gentry, which will in turn uphold the Browns' traditional familial governing position within Britain.

The assumed ability of public schools to teach students how to be "British" is afforded by the enclosed space of the schools' distillation and accentuation of "Britishness." Andrew Sanders believes public schools to be "miniature Englands" that function as microcosms of British politics, and where "future patterns of justice and social order could be based" (ix). As in the case of Squire Brown, school stories' early childhood sections suggest that public schools' allure to parents is their function as microcosms of England that offer concentrated versions of English virtues and values. The microcosms are intensified in their physical isolation from the macrocosm. For example, Rugby is described by Tom's carriage driver as a "[w]erry out-o'-the-way-place . . . off the main road" (Hughes 80-1), and subsequent school stories follow suit in

---

attending boarding school (since it is a less common experience). The boarding schools are established as restorative spaces able to socialize students into the best versions of themselves.

being enclosed worlds unto themselves. The schools' physical isolation is amplified in serialized girls' school stories of the early-to-mid twentieth century as authors go to great lengths to contain and separate schools from the outside world. For example, in Enid Blyton's series, *Malory Towers* (1946-1951), the school sits atop a cliff surrounded by sea; Elinor Brent-Dyer's *Chalet School* (1925-1970) takes place in a secluded chalet in the mountains of Switzerland; and Elsie J. Osxenham's *Abbey* (1914-1959) series is, as the name suggests, sequestered from the world in a ruined Abbey. The repeated architectural isolation is significant: as Michel Foucault notes, processes concerned with the discipline of bodies, which is the intention of the socialization process of public schools, advance "from the distribution of individuals in space" (141). A space that is "closed in upon itself" removes outside influences and creates a "protected place of disciplinary monotony" (Foucault 141). The isolated and enclosed school space creates an environment for students to immerse themselves in a microcosm of a "miniature England" that offers controlled experiences that comprise their moral education.

It is common in boys' school stories during the mid-to-late nineteenth century for parents to be living abroad in one of Britain's colonies. Take, for example, F. W. Farrar's *Eric; or, Little by Little* (1858), in which Eric's father is a civilian in India and sends his "wayward little Indian [Eric]" (ch. 1) to England to receive a *British* education. If not living abroad, parents are members of the gentry class, like Tom Brown's father, and maintain that a public-school education will best teach their upper-class sons how to govern as English gentlemen should. In these instances, parents consider the microcosms of public schools essential in imparting chivalrous virtues needed for their sons to continue in their family's British imperial legacy.

It is less common that parents live abroad in twentieth century boys' school stories. Instead, if fathers attended a public school, sons are sent to the same school to honour the

tradition. Legacy school attendance creates the notion that public schools are timeless and instinctively tied to Britain's illustrious history; as Knuth argues, "A nation's legitimacy, after all, depends on its ability to affirms its antiquity and past glory" (7). The shift is indicative of Britain's changing colonial project: maintaining rather than gaining control over foreign lands and peoples. The assertion of the nation's antiquity and past colonial glories defended Britain's continued imperial projects in a time during which these projects were coming under great scrutiny. In both cases parents are motivated by the belief that boys *need* go to public school to become true English*men*.

As the expectations of identity formation for boys and girls were different, it follows that characters in girls' school stories were sent to public school for different reasons. In Victorian-era girls' school stories, female protagonists have often lost their mothers and are raised by widowed fathers, grandparents, or spinster aunts. Guardians expect public schools to fill the maternal void in the motherless girls' lives and will socialize them for their future roles as wives and mothers.[17] Take, for example, Angela Brazil's *The Fortunes of Philippa* (1907), in which motherless Philippa receives a domestic education at The Hollies boarding school that includes

[17] In L. T. Meade's *A World of Girls* (1886), protagonist Hester is sent to public school because her mother has died and her father believes only women can complete her domestic education. In Sarah Fielding's *The Governess* (1749), most of the nine pupils have been sent to Mrs. Teachum's school because their mothers have died. In Brazil's *The Fortunes of Philippa*, Philippa's father rationalizes sending her away because "I feel there's something wrong about you, but I don't know quite how to set it right. After all, I suppose a man can't expect to bring up a girl entirely by himself" (ch. 1). Frances Hodgson Burnett's protagonist in *A Little Princess* (1905) is sent to a British boarding school by her widowed father so that she may receive the British feminine education he has been unable to provide her. Lastly, in Dorita Fairlie Bruce's series *Dimsie Among the Prefect*s (1923), a new character to the series, Hilary, is an orphan being raised by her grandparents, who is sent to school because her grandparents "are both too soft-hearted to manage her, [so] she must be sent away to someone who can" (10). These examples represent a small survey, as deceased mothers (and some fathers) is an epidemic in girls' school stories.

being taught “the most exquisite darning and the finest open hem-stitch” (ch. 4). Upon graduation, Philippa acts as her father’s “little housekeeper” (ch. 12). Phillipa also awaits a proposal from Edward, a man of empire whose “greatest desire seems to be that a war should break out to give him an opportunity of displaying his courage” (ch. 12). Philippa is socialized through her education as an obedient, hardworking, and uncomplaining domestic companion to her own father and wife to Edward. The glimpse into Philippa’s future proves The Hollies has been successful in providing the maternal character formation needed to produce a loyal wife and mother of Empire.

In twentieth-century girls’ school stories, the justification for attending public schools mirrors those found in boys’ school stories, as girls are sent to public schools to continue a family tradition. Mothers, having attended such and such a school, believe public schools are the ideal space for their daughters to receive their moral education. During the late Victorian period, girls’ school stories, like their girls’ public-school counterparts, depict a largely domestic-based curriculum, as opposed to the boys’ more academic classics education that includes Greek, Latin, British Literature and so forth. The gap in education began to close both in girls’ schools and the stories about them as more academic subjects were included in curricula. However, although students learned mathematics and languages in addition to sewing, girls were still expected to take up domestic roles upon graduation. Even with more academic subjects, the stories demonstrate that the public schools are ultimately concerned with teaching traditional maternal virtues. *Fifth Formers at St. Clare’s* (1945), the final book in Enid Blyton’s *St. Clare’s* series, closes with the narrator stating that the students had become “strong characters and leaders [who]

would make the finest wives and mothers of the future" (151), which reinforces a traditional and patriarchal conception of femininity.[18]

Beholding the School Space

When characters first arrive at school, they show great interest in the physical architecture of the space, and long, detailed descriptions are provided by narrators. David Steege argues these descriptions put an "emphasis on the specialness of these places to the entering student, a sense of wonderful novelty and possibility" (145). Hilary Clare and Sue Sims track the sentiment of "specialness" associated with public schools as continuing into the early twentieth century, when the experience of attending a public school was "at its most desirable, even glamourous . . . seen as a privilege" (7). The desirable glamour of attending public schools was reflected in the buildings themselves: many were housed in medieval castles and manors, and the lengthy descriptions characterize the public schools as elite spaces of antiquity, attractive in their glamorous materiality. In later school stories with oppressive disciplinary structures the same amount of attention is paid to the schools' physicality. These descriptions are not meant to emphasize the "wonderful novelty" of the schools, but rather the restrictive and oppressive disciplinary structures of the schools are reflected in, and even created by, their material construction. For example, in Jane Yolen's *Wizard Hall* (1991) the school towers "reminded Henry of a great beast" (5), and in Joan Crate's *Black Apple* (2016), Rose describes the "peaked

[18] While greater rights were being afforded to women in the early twentieth century, progress was slow, and girls' school stories operated as a utopia that imagined an academic future that had not quite yet arrived. For more on this shift and the utopian dreaming of girls' school stories see Judith Humphrey's *The English Girls' School Story: Subversion and Challenge in a Traditional Conservative Literary Genre* (2009); Rosemary Auchmuty's *A World of Girls* (1992); and Beverly Lyon Clark and Lavina Dhingra Shankar's article "When Women Tell Tales about School" (1994).

roof" of her residential school as falling "over the brick walls like a frown" (15). Student sentiments at beholding these architectural spaces are often those of fear, and a sense of forced anonymity replaces that of "specialness."

The first physical description of Rugby is laden with emotionality and is intent on inspiring the admiration and loyalty of Tom and readers. Hughes describes Tom's first impression of the school:

> Tom's *heart beat quick* as he passed the great school field or close, with its noble elms, in which several games at football were going on, and tried to take in at once the long line of grey buildings, beginning with the chapel, and ending with the School-house, the residence of the head-master, where the great flag was lazily waving from the highest round tower. And he began already to be *proud* of being a Rugby boy. (89, emphasis added)

Several things are gleaned about Rugby School and its inhabitants from the primary description of the space. Tom has an immediate affective reaction to the school's playing fields as his heart quickly beats in excitement and anticipation. The importance of sports and athletics in the community of Rugby is gestured to in its being the first thing Tom notices, and the *"*several" games being played indicates the involvement of the school community. That the games are played between "noble elms" aligns sports as a noble pursuit, as will be emphasized throughout the novel, and onward through the entire boys' and girls' public-school story canon. J. R. Honey argues that "[a]thleticism was one of the few new institutions of the late Victorian public-school which was typical and universal" (117), and Quigly notes that Hughes "loved sport and believed in its good influence as a way of teaching courage, cooperation, and loyalty" (53). Directly signalling the benefits of sport to England's imperialistic project, Auchmuty contends sports

were an important tool in "training the leaders of the future in their respective roles, whether as wise leaders or unquestioning followers. . . . [T]he suppression of individual desire was an important part of team-work" (*World* 60). Honey suggests that it is *this* moment in Hughes's novel that begins the obsession with sports in both schools and school stories (117).

The long line of grey buildings that begins with the church and ends with the school house visually illustrates the school's values: Christianity at the head, followed by learning that is informed by Christian principles. P. W. Musgrave argues that "Hughes tapped the spirit of the Broad Church movement which fitted the patriotism associated with the growing Empire and the need for social reform in a rapidly industrializing society" (82), and developed his notions of "muscular Christianity" in his writing of *Tom Brown*.[19] Hughes's beliefs were most likely informed by his own time at Rugby under Arnold's leadership, who held the conviction that school life "presented a valuable testing ground for character" (Honey 23). This is continued throughout the subgenre, for example, in Gunby Hadath's *Fall In!* (1916) the school was "once the site of a monastery wherein a pious brotherhood hid from the world" (10). In Antonia Forest's *Autumn Term* (1948), a new student remarks she can see the cathedral, and another student answers, "You can see it from everywhere" (37), which speaks to how Christian doctrines and practices are a panopticon that looms over the entire school. In Chapter Three, we will witness the expansion of Christianity as a disciplinary tool in Canadian Residential Schools. Christianity informs the values and practices of the majority of the public-school spaces, which

[19] "Muscular Christianity" is a concept developed in the Victorian era by thinkers such as Thomas Hughes and *Water Babies* (1863) author Charles Kingsley, that posits that physical health and strength, in combination with Christian principles, will strengthen the soul. Hughes's use of athleticism in *Tom Brown* reflects his belief that a strong body breeds a strong mind and soul that are better able to live up to Christian principles. Hughes held that if the body was weak, so also was the soul, and thus more open to the evils and temptations of the world.

constructs Christian doctrine as a key disciplinary tool with which to mould student bodies. Arnold's desire to Christianize society by first "saving" his students typifies the extent to which Christian principles informed the disciplinary structures and values of the public-school space, both in practice and representation.

Tom affectively responds with pride at becoming a member of this community simply by observing the physicality of the school. Significantly, Tom has yet to interact with any person at the school and it is the school itself that is able to make his heart beat faster and that causes him to feel proud to be a member. The physicality of the school space embodies the values and virtues of the public school, and the narrator's description emphasizes the space's material specialness. Students are themselves made "special" as members of the exclusive space and this membership produces pride that is developed into national pride as students are moulded to include virtues associated with Englishness.

The production of pride continues throughout the public-school story's Golden Age in the books' physical descriptions of school spaces as special and exclusive places. In Veronica Marlow's *For the Sake of the House* (1933), Barrie "gasps" when she sees her school is "huge and ancient and a *real* castle" that is not "sinister or forbidding" (22-23). Barrie's gasp (a signal of her awe and surprise) at the "real castle" defines the space as exceptional. Similarly, Gunby Hadath portrays the school space in *Won by a Try* (1922) as standing for hundreds of years, and watches generations pass, "[l]iving her own life, a little aloof, and giving lavishly of the best that is in her to generation by generation" (4). Hadath's narrator highly personifies the space as both maternal and remote, eternal and transcendent. The narrator explains that storms (both metaphorical and literal) come and go but "Castlebury *is*" (4), and as the school has "stood and kept faith with tradition. . . . [S]he will be standing a hundred years on" (4). Written during the

genre's twilight in popularity, the novel's school stands for the entirety of public schools and argues for their eternal value and legacy.

The descriptions of public schools construct them as desirable architectural places worthy of students' devotion and love, and public-school stories intended to impress the same emotional response upon the bodies of readers. Honey argues that "schoolboys" willingly used the word "love" to describe their connections to their public schools and those within it (192). Honey contends that the "emotional hold" public schools had over students during their schooldays continued well into adulthood (157), as is demonstrated in the "Old Boy phenomenon" of alumni associations that held the primary objective to express "loyalty to the old school" (153-4). Ahmed argues that love is a means of "bonding with others in relationship to an ideal. . . . [L]ove is crucial to how individuals become aligned with collectives through their identification with an ideal" (*Politics* 124). Entering as strangers, new students in their affections of pride and awe inspired by first seeing the school space, are immediately drawn into the collective of the student body in their devotion to and love of the space, which aligns and unites individuals with the collective student body. The ideal which bonds public-school characters together is the conception of a homogeneous "British" identity that includes (for schoolboys and girls) character traits of chivalry, selflessness, bravery, and loyalty. Student characters feel pride in their school space, their self-worth is bolstered in being part of the elite collective, and they simultaneously learn how to be "British" within the enclosed "miniature Englands" and develop pride in being allowed to don this national identity. For example, to return to Marlow's *For the Sake of the House,* Barrie's awe in finding that her school is housed in a "real" castle gestures towards an elite antiquity of Britain. Awe-inspiring buildings function as testaments to Britain's superiority in the ability to create such "special" spaces. Thus, when student characters develop pride and

love for their school spaces first from the materiality of the spaces, they concurrently acquire national pride in that the buildings gesture towards an elite national history that projects into the present and future.

Disciplinary Structures that Organize the Public-School Space

Partitions and the House System

The early childhood sections of public-school stories present students as raw materials and the public-school space as capable of making student bodies docile, or "subjected, used, transformed and improved" (Foucault 136). Foucault posits that the disciplining of bodies proceeds from the ways they are distributed within a space. Enclosure involves a space being "closed in upon itself" (141), and has been a popular form of distribution that has proved useful in army barracks, factories, and schools. An enclosure separates bodies from the outside world and maximizes production through "neutralizing inconveniences" from interruptions and distractions from peers or sources outside the enclosure (142). However, Foucault argues that simply enclosing bodies within a space does not produce "subjected and practised . . . 'docile' bodies" (138), but that further organization of the enclosed space through partitioning provides each individual their "own place; and each place its individual" (143). Partitioning is still a common practice in many British, American, and Canadian schools as the school space is broken up into separate rooms, and one school grade inhibits each room. Having the school space broken down into separate rooms, in which groups of students are assigned to, manages and manipulates students' movements throughout the entire school space. When individuals have their own place within the enclosure:

> Presences and absences [are established], to know where and how to locate individuals, to set up useful communications, to interrupt others, to be able at each moment to supervise the conduct of each individual, to assess it, to judge it, to calculate its qualities or merits. It was a producer, therefore, aimed at knowing, mastering and using. Discipline organizes an analytical space. (143)

Those who observe the partitioned students, such as the teacher assigned to a grade, measure and judge students against the whole, and individual students become "defined by the place [they] occup[y] in a series, and by the gap that separates [them] from others" (145). Enclosure and partitions, which are physical elements of the school space, create the possibility for individual bodies to be measured against other individuals and the collective, and as a result of these measurements individuals are further organized and distributed in the school space based on their relationality to others. The distribution of bodies based on ranks and privileges earned from performances in partitioned spaces "guarantee[s] the obedience of individuals" in students' desire to be found valuable in the eyes of the observers (147). The moral growth and character formation of students that public schools promise is not achieved through academics, as Squire Brown points out, but through the organization of the school space and its impression upon student bodies; the goal is to have student characters abandon individualism and inhabit instead the schoolboy/girl persona that celebrates and endorses the schools' and nation's values.

Partitioned spaces are "mixed spaces" because they are both physical and symbolic (Foucault 148); partitions organize the physical layout of the schools and the relationships contained within. The partitions are architectural and material because they govern the "disposition of buildings, rooms, furniture," and are "ideal" in their influence over peer relationships (Foucault 148). The public-school "house system" is one such mixed space that

distributes and disciplines student bodies through partitions. Depending on the size of the school, public schools are traditionally divided into three to ten houses with as few as fifty students in each house. Students sleep, study, and spend leisure time in their allotted house. The school houses sometimes have their own building that is separate from the academic and administrative buildings, or they will inhabit a section within a singular school building. Students are assigned to a house upon arrival or acceptance to a public school and remain a member of that house for the duration of their education. Rather than compete against other public schools, the houses compete against one another on the playing fields, which establishes long-held rivalries that direct individuals' loyalty towards their house. House members share sleeping quarters and studies with two to three other house members. Students are not allowed in another's sleeping quarters, and the privilege of visiting another's study is often reserved for upper-year students further along in their moral education. The partition of the house system is material in houses being located in specific spaces within the enclosure of the school and is symbolic/ideal in determining which bodies are allowed in those spaces. The mixed space of the house system limits and controls how bodies move in the school space and influences the relationships formed between students.

Students Discipline Themselves: The Prefect and Fagging Systems

The prefect and fagging systems further organize the school space and distribute bodies by naturalized arbitrary ranks. These systems awards students greater responsibility because of their ability to abide by the rules of the school space, and the systems make individual students more observable to adults. Prefects are "the Headmaster's moral agents, his fellow workers in the task of infusing superior elements into the society of boys" (Honey 11). Typically, one to two

students hold the position of prefect within each school house. Students awarded the title are those who have best followed the rules and regulations of the school space in their junior years. Rev. John Woolley, Headmaster of King Edward VI School in Hereford in 1844, was one such practitioner of the prefect system, and described the system as follows:

> [M]embers of the Highest Form in the School shall be invested under the name of Prefects with certain powers, immunities and privileges, which may enable them effectually to co-operate with their Masters, in the maintenance of necessary discipline, and in promoting a spirit of strict integrity, gentlemanly feeling, and Christian principles among their companions generally. (qtd. in Honey 44)

The special privileges of prefects, which could include private chambers and studies and the authority to discipline members of their houses, create a rhetoric that submission to public-school values could be rewarded with authority and liberty. In practice, it is a limited freedom as prefects are charged with upholding school rules and regulations that are determined by adult teachers and administrators. The "authority" given to prefects is another mechanism that controls and directs students' energy and attention towards one another. Prefects function as agents of the Headmaster/mistress, which enables the Head of the school to seem unobtrusive in his or her constant surveillance.[20]

While the prefect system involves a select number of students who work as agents of the Head to observe and discipline other students, the fagging system is more inclusive in that all senior students monitor and directly discipline an assigned junior student. Lower year "fags" act like a personal assistant to a senior supervisor and perform menial tasks for them, such as

---

[20] In Gillian Cross's 1982 series *The Demon Headmaster*, the students eerily chant, "All pupils shall obey the prefects. . . . The prefects are the voice of the Headmaster" (25), whenever the authority of a prefect is questioned.

cleaning the senior's bedroom and study, maintaining the fireplace, providing daily tea and lunch, mailing letters, and running errands in neighbouring villages and towns. The fagging system ensures that younger students, who have not yet been properly "aligned" by their public-school education, are kept busy (and thus out of trouble) in their service to senior students and are under constant observation. Any deviations, which can include not being where they should in the school space, neglect of fagging duties, poor performance in class or on the playing fields, or demonstrations of ungentlemanly behaviours (drinking, smoking, swearing), imbue seniors with the right and obligation to discipline their fag. Seniors hold the right to discipline their fags with stern lectures or corporal punishment. The fagging system ensures the conduct of every student is observed, judged, and corrected without the direct intervention of adult authority.

Junior students are monitored by their senior supervisor and their house prefect, but they are also given a taste of "liberty" in their studies in order to experiment with responsibility. At Rugby, two to three students share a study. Upon his arrival, Tom receives a school tour from his soon-to-be best friend, Harry East. The two boys quickly move through the school while readers receive detailed accounts from the narrator that describe the "great gates" and the school-house hall's "great room" with "two great tables" able to seat the entire student body (91-2). While the narrator emphasizes the prestige of the space through the repeated proclamations of its greatness, Tom's personal reverence is reserved for the "Rugby boy's citadel" (92): the study. Tom is surprised by Harry's study and is "astonished and delighted with the *palace* in question" (93, emphasis added). The narrator attributes Tom's "interest" in the space to the knowledge that he is "to become the joint owner of a similar home, the first place he could call his own" (94). Never having had a space that was "his own," Tom is excited to have a space partitioned off from the rest of the school in that it ostensibly provides him more liberty and responsibility than

he has previously experienced. Students are thus empowered with a sense of responsibility and maturity through the *gift* of their own space.

However, there are "bars and a grating to the window" of Harry's study, which is explained by the narrator as a "necessary" precaution "to prevent the exit of small boys after locking-up and the entrance of contraband articles" (93). The barred windows serve as symbols of the constrained freedom the space offers, as the space is ultimately a partition meant to contain student bodies and is governed by adult-created rules and regulations. There are limitations as to who can enter a study that ensures students remain in their assigned spaces. Students are allowed in their *own* studies only during scheduled hours, and the regular check-ins from prefects and seniors for whom the younger boys fag maintain regular surveillance of students' behaviour. That the study functions as a disciplinary device is not easily comprehended because of the narrator's focus on Tom's emotional response of being "astonished," "delighted," and "charmed" by the space, rather than suspicious of the bars locking him in (93-4). Indeed, Tom offers no reaction to the barred window, only that "Tom thought" the study, barred window and all, is "uncommonly *comfortable* to look at" (93-4, emphasis added).

The study impresses charm and comfort upon Tom, and the emotionality of the description impresses upon readers to be similarly affected by the space. Ahmed argues that emotions are not psychological states, but social and cultural practices (*Cultural* 9). Texts, such as the description of Harry's study, demonstrate the socially and culturally acceptable responses to specific spaces. The description of Harry East's study establishes the socially and culturally acceptable emotional response to the space: "delight." Tom's delight hides the disciplinary and manipulative functions behind the rules that structure the space. Fictional characters and readers are socialized through the emotionality of the study's description to not apprehend the markers of

discipline and control (the barred window), but rather to be content, even "astonished," to be given the opportunity to inhabit the space.

L. T. Meade creates an even more complex space of partitioned student liberty in her novel *A World of Girls* (1886). Mrs. Willis, the Headmistress of Lavender House, is "determined to give her girls a great deal more liberty than was accorded in most of the boarding-schools of her day" (ch. 9). Mrs. Willis grants her students "liberty" by "allowing" them to talk in their bedrooms, holding unsupervised play hours, not reading the letters girls send or receive,[21] and providing private compartments in the playroom. Mrs. Willis believes the compartments are pleasurable for students and create an atmosphere of "cheerfulness," for

> there is no pleasure so great as having, however small the spot, a little liberty hall of their own. In her compartment each girl is absolute monarch. . . . Here she can show her individual taste, her individual ideas. (ch. 9)

Like Tom, the students of Lavender House are considered empowered through the responsibility of having a space of their own.

In practice, however, students have little control over what takes place in the private compartments and students must abide by a strict set of rules to be granted, and to maintain, compartments. There are not enough compartments for every girl at Lavender House, and the limited number constructs the spaces as desirable and exclusive to only a select few students who get to inhabit them. Mrs. Willis decides which students receive a "liberty hall," and she does not base her decisions on academic merit, but on students' conduct: "No girl could be the *honourable* owner of her own little drawing-room until she had distinguished herself by some

[21] It was a common practice in public schools and their stories for Headmasters/mistresses to read letters students sent and received.

special act of *kindness* and *self-denial*" (ch. 9, emphasis added). Mrs. Willis's criteria for awarding the compartments emphasizes the value public schools place on students' moral education over that of academic achievements. Once a compartment is won, girls must continue their good conduct to maintain their palace of liberty: "To retain it depended also on conduct; and here again Mrs. Willis was absolute in her sway" (ch. 9). To be bestowed, and to maintain, a compartment, students must demonstrate they have made progress with their moral education by internalizing the virtues of kindness and altruism. Awarding partitioned spaces to students based on their conduct ensures that students continually aim to be obedient to Mrs. Willis's rules and regulations. The compartments are not "liberty halls" that empower students to enact their agency, but they ensure the obedience of students and motivate students to internalize the desirable character traits of obedience, selflessness, and loyalty.

Student bodies are disciplined and transformed into obedient and loyal citizens through their distribution in enclosed school spaces. The organization of the enclosed school space through partitions and rank "creates complex spaces that are at once architectural, functional, and hierarchical" (Foucault 148), and encourages the obedience of individual students in order to be successful in the space. Perpetuating a mythos of public schools as spaces that offer students responsibility through liberty, the careful organization of the space presents an illusion of agency that lulls students into participation; all the while, student characters' energies and ambitions are directed by the agendas and interests of the hegemony that produces the public-school space.

Safe Rebellions

Student characters' moral educations are facilitated through their experimentation with the boundaries of their schools' organizational structures. Student characters push and test the

disciplinary boundaries of their schools through rule-breaking and come to appreciate, respect, and obediently follow the structures that govern not only the school space, but the larger British nation from which the schools' structures are produced. The safe rebellions depicted in public-school stories are vital and frequent plot devices in the subgenre and key pedagogical tools in the moral education of student characters. Common rebellions include the use of cribs, smoking, drinking, swearing, sneaking out of bed at night, unsanctioned visits to neighbouring villages and towns, fag strikes, and the neglect of academic or spiritual (biblical study) work. The Golden Age public-school story permits and condones a measured degree of rebellion that masks the controlling, manipulative, and oppressive disciplinary structures of the spaces. Public-school stories' student rebellions are non-threatening to hegemonic power structures, but rather validate the disciplinary structures of the school space by providing moral lessons that instil the surface ideologies and virtues of obedience, loyalty, and devotion. There are several forms that safe rebellions take, but fag strikes, secret societies, and running away from school are the three most frequent plot devices used in the subgenre.

Fag Strikes

The prefect and fagging systems direct potential student rebellions towards student leaders (prefects and seniors) who uphold school law, rather than towards the teachers or school-Heads. Commonly, conflict will arise between junior and senior students, and usually for one of two reasons: seniors and prefects do not act as morally just leaders and abuse their privileges by bullying junior students; or junior students are arrogant, prideful, and lack the humility to serve their superiors. In both cases, fag strikes provide imperative lessons for senior students on how to govern, and for junior students on how to be governed. From fag strikes both senior and junior

students develop an obedience to, and respect for, the power structures that govern their school space.

A conflict arises in *Tom Brown* when senior students abuse their authority over the juniors, who then engage in an honourable rebellion aimed at restoring traditional power structures. The recently graduated prefects and seniors had handled the discipline of juniors "rough, but strong and just," and set "a higher standard" (Hughes 166). However, the prefects and monitors who replace the recent graduates threaten to "return [the school] into darkness and chaos" (166). The new sixth-form is comprised of younger students whose "cleverness had carried them up to the top of the school while in the strength of body and character, they were not yet fit for a share in the governments" (166-7), and older boys of the "wrong sort," who had not "caught the meaning of their position and work, and felt none of its responsibilities" (167). The entire sixth-form are not yet morally strong enough to handle and maintain their positions of power properly and this results in fifth-form students who are "a sporting and drinking set . . . usurping power" by fagging "the little boys as if they were præpostors, and to bully and oppress any who showed signs of resistance" (167). In both the sixth- and fifth-form classes, power is given to, and taken by, those who have not yet developed an acceptable strength of character to govern properly. The junior school students are roughly abused as a result, for "the fags were without their lawful masters and protectors and ridden over . . . by a set of boys whom *they were not bound to obey*, and whose only right over them stood in their bodily powers" (167, emphasis added). The sixth-form's lack of moral fortitude and the fifth-form's usurpation of the sixth's rightful power perverts the disciplinary structures that order and govern the school.

A fag strike corrects the pervasion of power and restores it to the ideal. To demonstrate that the rebellion is morally just, the narrator makes readers aware of the "wide influence" they

have "for good or evil on the society you live in" (167). The narrator teaches readers what kind of rebellious behaviour is beneficial to society, and this foreshadows Tom's fag strike as honourable:

> Quit yourselves like men. . . . [S]peak up, and strike out if necessary for whatsoever is true, and manly, and lovely, and of good report. . . . [D]o your duty and help others to do theirs, and you may leave the tone of feeling in the school higher than you found it. (167-8)

Significantly, the narrator breaks the fourth wall at this particular moment, and he takes care to define the upcoming rebellion as just because it upholds the greater moral good, not because Tom is too arrogant to serve or be subservient to others. The narrator's direct appeal reveals the narrow edge of misinterpretation that could follow from Tom's strike. Hughes does not write of Tom's rebellion to stir feelings of revolt in readers, but rather depicts Tom's strike as a morally just obligation that seeks to restore the social hierarchies of the public-school space. Tom leads a "*righteous* . . . strike against unlawful fagging" by proclaiming he will fag only for the sixth-form students, to whom he has a lawful obligation, and he refuses to fag for the fifth-form who have no rights to his service (194, emphasis added). Tom is successful in restoring the disciplinary power balance within his house, and the rebellion is an important lesson for Tom to defend hegemonic power structures when they are threatened. It is also a moral lesson for the fifth- and sixth-formers who learn to respect and obey the disciplinary power structures of the school space. The fifth-formers relinquish their usurped power and the sixth-formers more firmly exercise their right and obligation to discipline those beneath them, and to protect those under their care from abuse. In other terms, students learn how to govern and be governed through Tom's safe rebellion.

The second form of fag strike (proud junior students) functions as a pivotal plot point in Talbot Baines Reed's *Fifth Form at St. Dominic's* (1881). In the novel, the junior schools, who call themselves the Guinea-pigs and Tadpoles, unite against the fifth-form (who in this school *do* have the right to fag) by going on strike from fagging, believing the fifth-formers abuse their fagging privileges. Rather than a fight against injustice (like Tom's), the junior schools are proud and hate to "lower" themselves to menially serve the fifth-form students. The juniors' unearned arrogance is best shown in the protagonist, Stephen Greenfield, who is a new student at St. Dominic's. Stephen is left "gaping" when apprised of his fagging duties (40). Later, Stephen is filled with "rage" and "vow[s] vengeance" when a monitor (prefect) sensibly forbids the "pigs and poles" from playing cricket inside with an inkpot for a ball (45). Stephen's feelings of oppression at occupying the lowest rung of the school's social and power ladder is felt by "all the rest [the juniors] twenty times over" (45), as the Guinea-pigs and Tadpoles believe themselves to be taken advantage of by the fifth-form simply in being expected to fag.

A mutinous spirit takes over the junior schools when the fifth-form continues to call on their fags during a lower school festival, as "[t]he most sacred traditions of Guinea-pigs and Tadpoles were being trampled upon by the tyrants of the upper school! Not even on cricket feast night was a fag to be let off fagging!" (150). Infuriated at being made/expected to fag on their feast night, the junior school students declare themselves to be on strike from fagging and enter into a rebellion against the disciplinary structures of the school. Refusing to fag, the junior students "fortified their door with chairs and desks" and rouse their rebellion with "fiery orations and excited conjurations" (154). The juniors take on a mob-like energy, and the unjust rebellion is fed by their joint (unwarranted) feelings of mistreatment.

Rather than intervene and forcefully end the rebellion, the adults in charge let it continue for several days, and when the Headmaster enters, it is not as a disciplinarian, but as a wise soothsayer who illuminates a moral lesson to the junior students. The Headmaster visits the junior school before the Christmas holiday break. He utters no sympathy for the plight or rebellion of the junior forms, but softly chides and expresses his disappointment in them. To challenge their arrogance, the Headmaster joins their literature class and quizzes them on the material learned that semester, and "as might be expected, the exhibition was a miserable one" as no correct answers are found (168). The Headmaster uses the juniors' lack of academic knowledge as a metaphor for their deficient moral characters. The Headmaster warns the rebellious students,

> Do not think, as long as you know least of any one in the school you can pretend to rule the school. I hope some of you have been led to see to-day you are not as clever as you would like to be. If you try, and work hard, and stick like men to your lessons, you will know more than you do now; and when you do know more you will see that the best way for little boys to get on is not by giving themselves into ridiculous airs, but by doing their duty steadily in class, and living at peace with one another, and *submitting quietly to the discipline of the school*. . . . [N]ext term let me see you in your right minds, determined to work hard and do your part honestly for the credit of the good old school. (169-70, emphasis added)

The Headmaster never directly refers to the junior school's strike, but through his speech he links their poor academic achievements to their poor performances as fags. The Headmaster equates academic and moral education as interrelated, for being disciplined in one area will lead to success in the other. He reproaches their arrogance and explains they have not yet earned the

respect demanded of the fifth form students. The Headmaster's speech "made a very deep impression on the youthful members of the Fourth Junior," and they "felt very much ashamed of themselves," while their "veneration and admiration for the Doctor greatly heightened" (170). The rebellion is characterized as proof of the juniors' immaturity, and functions as a crucial moral lesson for the junior school that validates and honours the power structures they had previously raged against. The junior school students return from Christmas break eager to take on their fagging duties. The Guinea-pigs and Tadpoles learn from their rebellion to be humble, to respect and obey the authority of the fifth-form, and to admire and obey the leadership of the Headmaster. Their rebellion is represented as immature and foolish, but it provides the juniors a moral education in how to appreciate and submit to the discipline of the school.

The Danger of Secret Societies

L. T. Meade's *The Rebel of the School* (1914) depicts a secret society that challenges the power structures of the school space by providing a single student more influence than the Headmistress. Yet, as Beverly Lyon Clark and Lavina Dhingra Shankar note, "[A]ny real rebellion . . . is very soon followed by appropriate discipline and the girls are easily 'tamed'" (19). The secret society itself challenges the power structures of the school space, but in the rebellion's diffusion, and the rebels' taming, it is made a safe rebellion that provides an education to rebels and readers alike regarding the consequences of following school rules.

The "rebel" foreshadowed in Meade's title is Kathleen O'Hara, an extremely enticing and attractive character to her fictional school peers. Kathleen comes from a wealthy family that lives in a castle in the "extreme south-west of Ireland" (ch. 4). Her mother attended the Great Shirley School as a girl, and Kathleen is sent to the same school to continue the tradition. The school is

described as a utopian space where "there was no recent improvement in education, no better methods, no sanitary requirements which were not introduced into the Great Shirley School" (ch. 1). Kathleen is depressed to leave her castle and immediately hates what she deems an "ugly school" (ch. 4). Kathleen's hatred of the school is shown to be unfounded by the narrator, and the school community is described as a welcoming and idyllic place. Rather, Kathleen's hatred of the school characterizes her as arrogant and haughty, and it is her arrogance that inspires her to upset the power structures of the school by starting the secret "Wild Irish Girls' Society."

Kathleen acts as queen of the secret society. Kathleen creates several rules that members must govern themselves by, such as that no member may converse with the students attending Great Shirley on scholarship, otherwise known as "paying members" (ch. 10). Kathleen's club creates a division between students who have earned their place at the school and legacy students. More perilous is that the Wild Irish Girls must swear fealty to Kathleen above all, including the Headmistress. The secret society creates student-produced division in the harmonious school community and redirects the obedience and loyalty of the secret society members towards a student. Both rules greatly threaten adult authority in the school space and make the disciplinary structures of the school space extraneous to the Wild Irish Girls. In one of Kathleen's rousing speeches to her charges, she explains that the school

> wants to crush us. . . . [W]e mean the school no harm, and why shouldn't it let us alone? All we want is our fun, a little bit of liberty . . . and [to] have our own way, and meet when we please, and do as we like out of school hours. (ch. 21)

The secret society does not operate by the school's rules, but by the rules Kathleen creates, which constructs the society as an act of defiance that challenges the disciplinary structures of the school space.

The threat of the secret society reflects the macrocosm, as the secret society's Irish nationalist bent (Irish Girls run by a wild Irish girl) can be read as a metaphor for Irish political dissidence. In 1913, a year before the novel's publication, the British House of Lords rejected the Third Home Rule Bill that would have granted Ireland self-government within the United Kingdom. The Fourth Home Rule Bill was passed in 1914 but was postponed with the outbreak of World War I and was never instituted, leading instead to the division of Ireland into North and South in 1920. Kathleen's objection to abiding by her British school's rules echoes the Irish desire for autonomy that informed the creation of the Home Rule Bills, and her ultimate surrender to abide by British rule is a political statement that endorses Ireland's continued reliance on and submission to Britain.

Sensing a change in the student body, the Headmistress finds Kathleen's "effect on the girls is most disastrous" (ch. 20). The Headmistress hears whispers that a secret society is to blame for the shift of authority, and the Headmistress attempts to hunt out the leader of the society (Kathleen being strongly suspected) by giving alleged members the choice to name their leader, or "in the presence of the whole school," be "pronounced unworthy . . . [and] leave the school publicly" (ch. 20). The extent of members' loyalty to Kathleen becomes evident when no one comes forward even under the threat of expulsion. The society functions outside the rules of the school, which the Headmistress sees as eventually avalanching to chaos in her loss of control, and she explains to the entire school during an assembly,

> [R]ules are made not only to enable the girls to get the best possible education out of the school, but also that the greater education of mind and heart, which alone can build up a fine and useful character, may not be neglected. *That sort of education can only be given by conforming to principles*. (ch. 28, emphasis added)

Moved by the Headmistress's speech, Kathleen experiences a moral transformation, and she reveals herself as leader of the secret society to spare the expulsion of other members. The Headmistress senses a genuine change in Kathleen and the other secret society members, and none are expelled from school. The narrator confirms this change by reporting that Kathleen "gave up all thoughts of rebellion" for the rest of her schoolgirl career (ch. 29). Although the secret society is a revolt that challenges the disciplinary structures of the school space, Kathleen's transformation casts the rebellion as foolhardy and unjust, and ultimately functions to validate and valorize the disciplinary structures of Great Shirley School. All the rebels conclude that conforming to the principles of the school, or submitting quietly to the discipline of the school, is what will best facilitate their moral educations—what the Headmistress describes as the education of the heart.

Public-School Runaways

Running away from school is another common form of student rebellion that customarily culminates in runaways appreciating and missing the school once they have fled, and this precipitates the decision to return to school as newly-converted, obedient, and loyal students. Like Kathleen, runaways are usually new students who are predetermined to dislike the school and all in it. Some are angry to be separated from their families and are slow to accept their public school as a new home. Others enter with preconceived notions of the school space that are informed by school stories or other children and expect to hate living in spaces like Tom's Rugby or Eric's Roslyn.[22] In either case, the schools themselves have done nothing to earn the

[22] The incorrect influence of Victorian school stories on student expectations is present in early-to-mid-twentieth-century school stories. For example, in Winifred Darch's *The School on the Cliff* (1933), a new student asks where she can find a crib because "I thought boys always used

scorn of the runaway and are represented as utopian spaces. The always self-motivated return of the runaway ultimately validates the power structures of the school and reinforces the moral education provided by the disciplinary structures of the school space as being an idyllic experience.

In Joanna Lloyd's *Jane Runs Away from School* (1946) the novel's protagonist, Jane, is characterized as stubborn and foolish in the rejection of her new public school, and her escape is symptomatic of Jane's inability to correctly appreciate the qualities of the school space. Jane's father, a military man, relocates to a station in India. Jane would rather go with her parents to India and is in "despair" when she learns she will instead be sent to public school (9). Jane grieves to be separated from her parents, and her grief motivates her determination to "hate the place [Bramber Manor] and hate the place she would!" (10).

Jane's unfounded obstinacy blinds her to the idyllic reality of Bramber Manor, which begins upon her arrival at school when she notices "nothing of the splendid trees on either side nor of the beautiful buildings before her" (10). Jane's peers are habitually kind and welcoming despite Jane's rudeness to them and her self-inflicted isolation. Jane often "forgets" her hatred and is overcome by the pleasantness of the space, but she is her own worst enemy and fights any temptation of happiness by "remember[ing] that she hated school and that she was going to run away" (48). The academic lessons are enjoyable, especially Miss Laing English's class, and during English Jane often forgets to "speak in her usual sulky voice" (41). In gym class, Jane

---

them once upon a time, as in *Tom Brown's School-Days*?" (75). In Dorita Fairlie Bruce's *Dimisie Among the Prefects* (1944), a new student enters the school aggressively on watch for bullies, to which older students reply, "[Y]ou talk as though you'd been reading a lot of early Victorian school stories for boys!" (41). These examples not only contribute to the argument that girls as well as boys were reading boys' school stories, but also that these stories came to influence student expectations regarding school.

forgets “that it was a silly class of girls” (48). Though Jane admits the school is nothing like the stories she had “gathered from old bound magazines,” she is “slow in taking in the facts around her” (49) and believes it “too late to change her mind even if she wanted to” in regard to both her hatred of the school and her plot to run away (68). Jane’s frequent “forgetting” to hate the school, and the welcome she receives from peers and teachers, makes it undeniable to readers that Jane’s hatred of the school is unjustified. Jane’s groundless hatred casts her rebellion (both her hatred and plan to run away) as without substance and even foolish.

Jane succeeds in her plan to run away and makes it to her aunt and uncle’s home, but once her mission is accomplished, she soon begins to miss Bramber Manor. Her aunt and uncle ask why she ran away, which causes Jane to remember “the jolly crowd of girls . . . the games, the gym, the Sunday walks, the reading aloud of *The Abbot*, to Miss Laing’s English lessons,” and Jane must admit, “I don’t know . . . It wasn’t really that bad” (140). Upon realizing that her running away was unwarranted, Jane is eager to return to school, and upon her re-entry is newly determined to welcome the school as it had her. On her return, Jane is “very glad that she was going back to school” and realizes “how awful it would be when she was grown up if she hadn’t any schooldays to talk about” (180). Jane’s transformation is emphasized at the close of the novel; when she sees her fellow classmates, she is “sure there had never been such a decent lot of girls,” and considers herself “lucky to be at Bramber Manor” (254). Thus, Jane fully accepts the public school and her place within it, and her rebellion functions as the lesson that reforms her character to include traits of obedience, devotion, and loyalty.

Exceptions to Safe Rebellions?

The overtly didactic school stories may appear to offer a counter to safe rebellions in their construction of the school space as a "den of sin" in which innocent children are corrupted by their peers. The most famous example of this is F.W Farrar's *Eric; or Little by Little* (1858) in which Eric squanders every advantage his public school provides him by valuing vice over virtue. *Eric* was released a year after *Tom Brown*, and as a result of the close publication dates, some scholars (Musgrave, Quigly, Clark, Auchmuty), including myself, pair Hughes and Farrar's novels together for "inventing" the school story subgenre. Farrar's pessimism was not as popular as Hughes's optimism, and because the perception that *Eric's* heavy-handed didacticism was rife with "gloomy, doom-laden tales of adolescent saints and sinners," there were constant harsh criticisms of it (Quigley 43). Most often the book was accused of being too "full of exaggerations" (Musgrave 7), and even Farrar himself admits, "The lacrimosity is, I know, too much" (R. Farrar 75).[23]

As a new junior student, Eric despises the schoolboys who smoke, drink, and curse, but is later shocked at how

> . . . gradually it [swearing] had become quite a graceful sound in his ears—a sound of entire freedom and independence of moral restraint; an open casting off, as it were, of all authority, so that he had begun to admire it. (Farrar 93)

Claudia Nelson argues that Eric's "moral decline is signalled by his delight in the 'open casting off . . . of all authority'" (61), which creates his rebellion as potentially dangerous in challenging

[23] Rudyard Kipling pokes fun at the gloomy text in his highly ironic *Stalky & Co* (1897) when his three anti-schoolboy protagonists (who prefer to stay in their studies and read Ruskin than attend House matches) jokingly paw through *Eric* ("oh--, naughty Eric! Let's get to where he goes in for drink" [75]), and later draw on Eric's rhetoric to outsmart the sixth-year prefects ("Wasn't it glorious? Didn't I 'Eric''em splendidly?" [273]).

the authority of the school space. Eric's teachers and Headmaster continually attempt to persuade him to give up his life of sin, and Eric experiences moments of revelation, only to relapse into vice. Eric eventually drops out of school and falls into poor health from living in squalid conditions. On his deathbed, Eric regrets not listening to his teachers and missing the moral education Roslyn School had to offer (*Eric* 482, 485). Ultimately, even Eric's rebellion is made safe in that it does not challenge power structures of the school space, but valorizes, validates, and attaches tremendous consequences to the defiance of them.

Rudyard Kipling's series of short school stories, *Stalky and Co*. (1899) also seems a departure from the subgenre's safe rebellions in that Stalky, Turkey, and Beetle challenge the foundation of public schools in their preference for reading over joining their peers in games of football. Unlike Eric, the three protagonists never regret (even in their adult lives) their rule-breaking, which on the surface seems to directly challenge the disciplinary structures of public-school spaces. However, Petzold argues that Kipling's departures from public-school story conventions "confirms rather than rejects" the values of the subgenre (19). What separates Kipling from the likes of Hughes and Farrar is his approval of students drinking, smoking, cursing, and other rule-breaking. For Kipling, these behaviours are "natural and healthy," and students' fight for freedom within the ever-encroaching school space "sharpens their wits, preserves their vitality, and cultivates their spontaneity, self-confidence, and resourcefulness," which are all qualities they will require when they fight for freedom in Her Majesty's service (Petzold 20). For Kipling, rule-breaking that challenges the structures, boundaries, and rules of the public school are essential in students' moral education.

Quigly labels Kipling's school story an "imperial manual" in which "life at school is shown as directly parallel with life in the Empire" (116). In the collection's final short story, a

grown Stalky demonstrates how valuable his public-school moral education is in Her Majesty's army. Quigly notes the final story explicitly informs readers, "Look what happens! Send them to a school like that a see how they turn out!" (116). A group of soldiers, including some classmates of Stalky's, trade stories about Stalky in battle. One man details an instance when Stalky expertly hid himself and his men within the natural landscape and abandoned buildings to avoid being detected by the enemy, precisely as Stalky had done as a student to enjoy his cigars and books without teachers disturbing him. The evasion tactics Stalky uses in Afghanistan to hide himself and his men are the same he used to evade his most hated teacher, King, at school, and this directly aligns the usefulness of his rule-breaking to his future service to the empire. Janet Adam Smith argues that Stalky is a celebration of the "solitary hero, honourable and brave" and in Kipling's characters' crafty survival, they were "of more use to the Empire" then the "poetical heroes [who] tend to die" (qtd. in Quigly 117). Kipling's departure from generic conventions validates, rather than challenges, the values and pedagogical intentions of the subgenre, casting the work itself to be a form of safe rebellion.

Conclusion

The discipline of student bodies into docile and obedient British citizens progresses from their distribution in the enclosed space of the public school. The organization of the enclosed space through methods of partition and rank enables the safe rebellions of student characters to test the boundaries of power and authority and results in their appreciation of, and loyalty to, the morally just leaders of the school. Student characters receive their moral education from safe rebellions that transform them into obedient and loyal British citizens. Although highly organized in order to control, manipulate, judge, and observe students, the disciplinary structures are not perceived

to be oppressive by student characters, nor are they described by the authors and narrators to be considered oppressive by readers. Rather, the high control exerted over school spaces is depicted as in the best interests of students because of the spaces' governance by morally just adults who are themselves governed by the morally just British government.

The following chapter examines youth-written school stories that openly challenge the disciplinary structures of the school space while questioning the value of the virtues and character traits endorsed by the public-school ethos. If the stories discussed in this chapter endorse the products of public school as being devoted and loyal men and women ready to go where the nation directs them, the following chapter examines texts written by youth that openly question the quality and use of the public-school product, and the blind obedience to authority more generally. The disciplinary organization of school space, as presented in the Golden Age public-school space, continues, but how the student bodies react to the force encounters of education shifts from blind obedience to critical thinking. Evidence of this critical thinking is demonstrated, most significantly, in that the texts are written by public-school students.

Chapter Two

"It Explained Us to Ourselves":
Resistance Through Every Day Tactics and Practices in Youth-Authored School Stories

> "Back to the old life again. Nothing was changed. The same talk, the same interests, all the old things the same. Only he was altered."
>
> —Alec Waugh, *The Loom of Youth*

The surface ideologies in Golden Age boys' and girls' public-school stories almost always venerated imperialist ideologies through representations of disciplinary school spaces that instilled traits of obedience, loyalty, and national pride in student characters and implied readers. The Golden Age texts largely do not question hegemonic power structures, and characters are moulded by hegemonically produced school spaces into submissive and devout British citizens ready and eager to serve the Crown. While the publication of public-school stories slowly declined during the early- to mid-twentieth century, those that were published continued to represent a remarkably similar type of disciplinary school space to that represented in their Victorian predecessors. Britain's involvement in the First World War (28 July 1914 to 11 November 1918) did much to slow and ultimately end the popularity of public-school stories. The war provided the ultimate justification for the disciplinary structures of the schools as it was the ideal market for the products of the public school, and those to whom the ethos was transmitted (the young readers), to demonstrate their loyalty and obedience. Young men rushed to enlist, and young women eagerly participated in the war effort. The consequences of such blind obedience and loyalty was made evident in the Great War in that doing what was expected

of them resulted in a staggering number of casualties and a substantial loss of an entire generation.

This chapter examines the public-school stories *The Harrovians* (1914) by Arnold Lunn and *The Loom of Youth* (1917) by Alec Waugh, and two polemic responses to Waugh's novel by Martin Browne (*A Dream of Youth: An Etonian's Reply to "The Loom of Youth"* [1919]) and Jack Hood (*The Heart of a Schoolboy* [1919]). Waugh, Browne, and Hood were each seventeen during the time of their writing and their texts are thus rare examples of youth-authored school stories and accounts that deconstruct the public-school space in order to imagine alternative pedagogies. Lunn was twenty-five at the time he wrote *Harrovians*, and he based the novel on the journal he kept while at public school. The four authors all use the public-school story to interrogate the disciplinary tactics they felt were responsible for the moral decline of society and the tremendous loss of human life in the First World War, and they each came to varying conclusions on how reform should be implemented in the schools. The grief the authors experienced because of the Great War challenged their national pride and made their unquestioning obedience and loyalty to their schools suspect. Their questioning was dangerous as it confronted not only the public-school space, but the political, moral, and social structures of British society that had produced their school spaces.

Each of the four authors cites his own text as the first authentic and realistic account of public-school life as a result of being a public-school student (Browne and Hood) or recently graduated (Lunn and Waugh). Because of their close proximity to student life, the young authors declare themselves the true authorities on public-school life and as best-suited to imagine and implement reforms to the public-school system. In claiming to write the first accurate accounts, the authors discredit representations that had come before as fantastical and argue that the public-

school pedagogy fails to produce wholesome men and women of Empire. The texts do not go so far as to call for the complete demolition of public schools and their pedagogies, but rather the authors dream of a reformed public-school space that is led by autonomous students who live actively in their school spaces and who make meaningful choices regarding how they choose to inhabit those spaces.

Student Rebellions through Reading and Critical Thinking

The four authors, and Lunn's and Waugh's protagonists, uncover the disciplinary structures of their school spaces through strategies of critical thinking that are stimulated by reading practices that defamiliarize their school spaces. This is accomplished by the authors' reading practices in that Waugh was inspired by reading *Harrovians* to write *Loom*, and reading *Loom* was the impetus for Browne's and Hood's polemics. Lunn's and Waugh's protagonists also take part in subversive reading practices that stimulate critical thinking. Henri Lefebvre argues that space is not produced to be easily read but is designed to conceal the ways it works upon the body (Lefebvre 142, 143). The covert methods that work upon bodies is explored by Pierre Bourdieu who developed the concept of *habitus* to examine how the dispositions of an individual or group (the public-school student) are informed by their conditions of existence (the public school). The public-school space is a realm of existence that produces a *habitus* that informs enduring dispositions of those who occupy the *habitus*. Bourdieu explains that practices tied to a *habitus* (the public-school space) appear naturalized and conceal the "structuring structures" of the space (*Logic* 53). The structures that characterize a "determinate class of conditions of existence" produce a specific *habitus* that comes to inform an individual's or group's "perception and appreciation of all subsequent experience[s]" and results in what is arbitrary being considered

"reasonable" and "common sense" behaviours (*Logic* 53). When the arbitrary is naturalized, it is difficult to comprehend artificial structures as being anything other than "reasonable" or "common sense": this supports Lefebvre's notion that space is not constructed by hegemonic powers to be easily recognized. Although it is difficult, Lefebvre believes it *is* possible to comprehend naturalized structures of social space through "critical thought" that makes apparent to individuals how social space, or one's *habitus*, is generated "in the service of state and power in general" (106). Bodies in space are not always passively guided by artificial structures, and they are capable of apprehending the "structuring structures" through critical thought that defamiliarizes the familiar and naturalized.

Michel de Certeau contends that individuals can escape disciplinary structures through the appropriation and manipulation of space through everyday practices that defamiliarize space, such as reading and the art of conversation. The concept of "defamiliarization" in terms of literary studies comes from Viktor Shklovsky. Shklovsky argues that "routine actions become automatic" and actions "retreat" into the "unconscious-automatic domain" (161). Shklovsky uses the example of holding a quill for the first time as compared to the feeling of the ten-thousandth time in which one barely notices the sensation of using the quill (161). Shklovsky argues that is it through routine that "life becomes nothing and disappears" (161), or in which one stops experiencing the sensations of daily life. Shklovsky's example of the quill is comparable to feelings and actions within spaces, such as a kindergarten student's first day at school as compared to feelings in subsequent years. The new and strange become normalized and automatic through routine, and how students move through and interact in their school spaces can be made "unconscious" and "automatic" by the routine. Shklovsky argues that the "goal of art is to create the sensation of seeing, and not merely recognizing, things . . . [A]rt is the means

to live through the making of a thing" (162). Shklovsky calls this method defamiliarization, which is the process of making the familiar strange. The method of defamiliarization in literature involves "not calling a thing or event by its name" but instead to "describ[e] it as if seen for the first time" (163). For Shklovsky, the goal of defamiliarization is to "make one not 'recognize' but 'see'" (167), and is a method of being freed from the routine that makes life nothing (161).

In the public-school stories and polemic responses examined in this chapter, reading and engaging in philosophical conversations activate the authors' and protagonists' ability to think critically about their public-school space, both the architectural structures and the disciplinary structures they produce, and inspire new perspectives that defamiliarize the school space and its practices. The familiar being made strange makes it possible for characters to comprehend, or in the words of Shklovsky to "see," the disciplinary tactics behind the naturalized artificial structures. With altered perspectives, the authors and protagonists develop rebellious and subversive attitudes towards their schools. Theirs are not rebellions that engage in violence and fury, but they are individualized "dark nights of the soul" in which protagonists challenge pre-existing power structures through the denial of complete loyalty and obedience to hegemonic space. In their rebellions, the authors and protagonists come to consider it their responsibility to be active agents in their own moral education and character formation. In Lunn's and Waugh's novels the protagonists develop a disgust for athletics and instead fervently read extracurricular philosophical and literary texts that stimulate genuine moral growth. Through the characters' subversions, the authors imagine educational alternatives and advocate for the "return" of "true" education in which students move from being passive to active participants in their education.[24]

[24] I use "return" and "true" cautiously, for the terms assume a singular, definitive educational structure that has at one time existed. I am suspicious of the authors' assumptions that an ideal was once achieved in the public-school space, as there is no evidence of this; as well, I am

The "true education" modelled in the texts foreshadows the provocations for similar education ideals in later educational philosophies. Many educational philosophers define "true education" as inseparable from critical thinking. Paulo Freire, for example, advocates a pedagogical model driven by "authentic, humanist . . . generosity" (36), in which efforts are made to "engage in critical thinking" (56). Clive Harber imagines that the alternative to authoritarian education structures is "true education . . . the attempt to create critical awareness, ideas and values by open balanced discussion and analysis of a range of evidence and opinions, including non-dominant ones" (23). Peter McLaren argues for a revolutionary critical pedagogy which "enables student to see" through the dominant structures of class that exercise power to protect power (10). Henry Giroux advocates for critical education, which fosters self-reflexivity, compassionate relationships with others, and thinking critically about the world we inhabit (*Violence* 174); moreover, Giroux notes that critical education is not easily incorporated because students who are "critical agents" (*America* 120), and who "value collective well-being, examine public issues, lead rather than follow, embrace reasoned arguments over opinions, and reject a narrow conception of common sense as an engine of truth" (*America* 120), are a threat to current neoliberal hegemonic structures.

Disturbed by the catastrophic casualties of World War I, the authors advocate for the "return" of "true" education that prioritizes pedagogies that stimulate critical thinking and afford students autonomy to pursue subjects of interest. The four texts, while not always in agreement with one another, enjoy a close symbiotic relationship: Lunn's *The Harrovians* directly inspired Waugh to write *Loom*; *Loom* was the catalyst for Browne's written response to the novel; and

---

hesitant about the reductive qualities of embracing a singular "true" pedagogical practice. However, I use the terms because they are reflective of the language the authors themselves use.

Browne's and Waugh's texts were the inspiration for Hood's response. Waugh's *Loom* uses the everyday practice of reading to stimulate his protagonist's new perspectives and motivate his appropriation and manipulation of the school space to direct his own academic education in place of the disciplinary lessons of the playing fields. Waugh's novel inspired Browne's and Hood's responses: through their own subversive act of reading *Loom*, Browne and Hood also reimagine the public-school space as empowering student autonomy and participation. In each example, reading is a subversive practice that challenges the power and disciplinary structures of the school space, appropriates the space under student authority, and imagines reorganizations to the space that would reform their current hierarchical power relationship between youth and adults. The authors' non-conformist and revolutionary attitudes are in turn recommended to readers of these texts as an alternative to contemporary student experiences: indeed, they imagine students as the only ones able to transform the public-school space to meet the new ideal.

World War I and School Stories

A Call to Arms

School stories from the pre-war period influenced the young soldiers of World War I nearly as much as the Great War ultimately changed the public-school story genre. The First World War was a young man's war. Historian Richard van Emden notes it was standard for Britain to take young soldiers into battle, but the "sheer number" of young men who served in the First World War was staggering in that "[a]mong all those serving in France by the end of 1915 were more under-age soldiers than the entire force that Wellington took to Waterloo exactly one hundred

years earlier" (xiv).[25] The Great War continues to rank high among the deadliest conflicts in human history, and van Emden estimates that a third of the total casualties were underage and older adolescents who contributed to Britain, her colonies, and allies' loss of a generation of young men.[26]

To determine the appeal of service to young Britons, Canadians, and (to a lesser extent and at a later date) Americans, some point to the "potent mythos that figured war as romantic: a time for youthful heroism, male comradeship, and an opportunity to display widely admired characteristics" (Reynolds 256). Indeed, van Emden lists the "belief in King and Country" as among the many enticements for young men to enlist (xv). Considering the young Canadian men who served during the First World War, Mark Moss contends that the war, "at least the chance for the adventure of war, was a desirable thing" in that it provided the opportunity to show allegiance and obedience to Britain (1). Others point directly to children's literature, and most specifically public-school stories, as one source that proliferated the "war as romantic" ethos that arguably drew many to enlist. Isabel Quigly notes that for decades the public-school ethos, largely administered by school stories, had built up the belief that "men would go anywhere and do whatever was expected of them. The First World War seemed to justify that belief. They did exactly what was expected of them and most of them died" (273). Historian Peter Parker argues that the extreme popularity of the public-school story during the late-nineteenth and early-

---

[25] "Underage" in military terms meant under eighteen and did not include the thousands of older adolescents (aged nineteen to twenty) who served, the young men who were underage when they enlisted but came of age during the war, nor the young men who served in uniformed groups like the Territorial Cadet Force. To put the number of young men in perspective, van Emden estimates that in 1914 as many as 40,000 young men aged eighteen or less, with almost as many under the age of twenty, served in volunteer uniformed groups in Britain (16).

[26] Britain and her colonies lost nearly 900,000 in military-related deaths ("Annual Report" 38), Canada contributing upwards of 65,000 to that number ("Annual Report" 38), with the United States losing 116,516 (DeBruyne and Leland 2) men during its participation in the war.

twentieth centuries led to the "ideals and codes of the schools reaching a far wider audience than the privileged minority who were educated in them" (18). In light of their popularity, Parker reasons that it is "scarcely surprising that when war was declared volunteers from all levels of society queued at the recruiting stations," for these young men had been instilled with the ethos of the public-school student and were "encouraged to follow in the footsteps of storybook heroes" (18).

Kate Agnew and Geoff Fox likewise contend that the "tales of derring-do in remote corners of the Empire" were rivalled in popularity only by "stories set in fictional or actual schools, which in their way also contributed to a confident stance towards any possibility of war" (6). As examined in Chapter One, public-school story characters were imbued with sentiments of national pride, and Agnew and Fox note that "[f]rom epic encounters on the playing fields of Eton or Greyfriars, it was a natural progression to exchange cricket flannels or footer [football] kit for army or naval uniform" (6). While historians and children's literature scholars focus on school stories' male readers, the sentiments of national pride may well have emboldened female readers to take part in war efforts. Angela Brazil's *A Patriotic Schoolgirl* (1916), for example, takes place during the First World War and portrays schoolgirls as obsessively concerned with how to support soldiers, a devotion Brazil may have hoped her female readers would emulate. The patriotism instilled in actual schools, and transmitted through girls and boys school stories, thus may have played a major part in emboldening the many young women to take part in the war effort and the many male youth who rushed to prove their worth in the trenches.[27]

[27] Some stories make an explicit connection with war through setting their narratives during war-time and providing a heavy-handed romantic war ethos. For example, Harold Avery's *Soldiers of the Queen* (1898) takes place during the Anglo-Egyptian War of 1882 and follows two schoolboys from their training at public school to their adulthood, where they utilize their public-school education to excel as loyal and self-sacrificing soldiers.

The emphasis on athleticism and the playing fields, initiated by Thomas Hughes's depiction of Rugby in *Tom Brown's Schooldays,* was bolstered in early twentieth-century public-school stories and implemented further into actual school pedagogy as a means of preparing students physically and psychologically for war. S. P. B. Mais wrote several influential books about his time working in public schools both as a teacher and headmaster (Rossall, Sherborne, and Tonbridge). In *A Public School in War Times* (1916), Mais details a public-school regime that combines poetry, military tactics, physical training, and spirituality with the intention to produce an ideal soldier. Jenny Holt argues that like Rudyard Kipling, Mais "had initially believed that this would be a Stalky war, fought with cunning and tactics, rather than wholesale manslaughter" (216). Mais was hopeful that the Great War would put an end to national degradation and suggested that through the combination of aesthetic and military ideals in the public schools, the "tribulation" of war would teach boys the "solace, the uplifting inspiration that comes from . . . poetry," which could bring about an "unbelievable renaissance" of the artist and the "heightened ideals of the boy of 1915" (4). Mais held that the "aesthetic delight wrought in us by the old buildings and cloisters in the school close" provided the ideal space in which to combine aesthetic and military ideals with which to give birth to a renaissance within students (4).[28]

---

[28] Similar programs to Mais's, called "Preparedness Movements," were present in Canada and the United States. The notion that being prepared for war was an effective means of preserving peace inspired many schools in Britain, Canada, and the United States to implement programs that produced military-ready school graduates (Zieger 157). Many schools implemented military drills and training in part because of a fear that male students were becoming "soft" under the education of a growing female teaching force (Zieger 159), and from the belief that Britain and Canada were proved unprepared during the Second Boer War (1899-1902). In Canada, the Lord Strathcona Trust Fund was established in 1909 to improve the physical capacities of schoolboys through military-style training and athletics. It was hoped the programs would create habits of obedience and would bring the students up in patriotism not only to Canada, but also to the

Mais's hope for the war faded when confronted by the countless number of students' deaths. Tempered by grief, Mais began to advocate for education that granted students more autonomy so that they could learn to think critically and to not blindly follow orders (Holt 216). The national pride imbued by the moral education of the public schools that, in turn, produced obedience and loyalty was challenged by the sorrow felt over the overwhelming loss of life as revealing the cost of national pride. Like Mais, the confidence of some public-school story writers was likewise shaken, as Holt explains,

> During and after the First World War the entire thrust of the school genre changed. Indeed, from the postwar period onwards, the political and pedagogical confidence of writers was so shaken that it is it often hard to identify any coherent message at all. (209)

As public perception of the public schools came under scrutiny, the school stories about these spaces changed—some more dramatically than others. Damningly, Jeffery Richards notes that many held the public-school system as responsible for the Great War because of the schools' ideologies of "tyranny of the bloods" in which "games took precedence over learning (in particular history) and the ruling elite emerged ignorant, complacent, insular and backward-looking" (232). While these criticisms did emerge, they were often met with extreme opposition and ultimately did not spur any immediate or lasting revolutions in the public-school system in terms of pedagogy and discipline. Parker reasons that Britain's need during the war for reassurance that "young men laying down their lives" were doing so "gladly for a just cause, that

---

motherland of Britain. It was argued that "[p]atriotism in military drill and physical education served to Canadianize new immigrants; character-building led to manliness; and drill in general served to instil obedience, punctuality, and loyalty" (Moss 97). Similarly, in the United States, it was feared that Americans were far behind other countries' military powers and that through "physical training under scientific supervision" at schools a "different race" would be produced: one of "patriotic, law-abiding, physically sound m[en]" (Young).

the old public-school traditions of chivalry, self-sacrifice, fair-play and selfless patriotism were being maintained on the field of battle" outweighed the desire to critically examine the school space and its disciplinary practices for much of the public (27).

The dashed optimism of Mais is reflective of many other "Old Boys'" hopes that the Great War would be easily won by public-schoolboys because of the educations they had received. However, it was not only the "Old Boys" who were interrogating their once-beloved schools, but youth who were currently entrenched in the system. Supposing the public schools were preparing them for slaughter rather than leadership, a few texts by youth appeared on the market that offered the first published school stories written by adolescents who depicted their experiences in realistic and unromantic tones. These texts are highly critical of the school space and reject undisputed national pride, loyalty, and obedience that the public-school space attempt to impress upon them.

Young Adults Challenge the Public-School Space

Lunn's Machiavellian Education

Arnold Lunn wrote *The Harrovians* (1914) when he was twenty-five and based the fictional account on a diary he kept as a schoolboy at Harrow (1902-7). In a 1941 interview, Lunn explains he kept the diary for practical reasons: he believed boys were "crude realists who lived in a world of fact. Our elders were sentimentalists who lived in a world of fiction" (Woods). Determined to maintain the unsentimental lens of youth, Lunn felt the diary would challenge the self-deception of nostalgia. The diary also provided the blueprint for what Lunn claims is the first realist school story ever written (Woods), in that it sets out to describe in accurate and unromantic terms "the way elite adolescents at Harrow learned not to facilitate inclusive government, but to manage, coerce and control the populace" (Holt 217). There are no rebels in

the novel, but rather the novel itself revolts against the space in the tough and, self-acclaimed, truthful depiction of public-school life. Lunn claims authority over the school space from the Old Boys and school governors by proclaiming his account the "authentic" representation, and he challenges the supposed merit of the public schools' disciplinary structures and their products.

Lunn's novel was influential to Waugh and other schoolboys, but stirred controversy with adult readers, for "criticism of the public-school system from within was regarded as revolutionary heresy" (Woods). Quigly ascribes the tone of Lunn's novel, "its brashness and genial send-ups, its questioning of old values and the whole truculent, self-confident, aggressive, enquiring, unsentimental treatment of things," as what either endeared or enraged readers (157).[29] Lunn did not intend to disparage Harrow, or the public-school system in general: as he admits, "My career was not unsuccessful . . . and there is nothing in my book to suggest disapproval of Harrow," but he believes the novel caused controversy because "in writing the novel that I had kept a careful record of the cynicism of Harrow youth rather than the sentiment of old Harrovians" (Lunn qtd. in Quigly 155). The realist lens did away with sentimental depictions of schoolboys and showed students as fed into the machine of athletics to be curtailed of their individuality and fit into the indistinguishable whole.

---

[29] Quigly does not address the frankness with which Lunn discusses sexuality in the novel, which no doubt was another reason the book caused a scandal. Lunn includes an episode where students openly discuss their distaste for how sex is addressed in chapel, and how they long for more forthright discussions from faculty regarding women and sex. After a disappointing sermon on the dangerous temptation of women to men, a group of characters reason that not just the "horrid boys jaw about women," but that everyone does, "and why the devil shouldn't one discuss it? It's the most interesting thing in life" (137). Even the narrator intervenes to explain to readers, "These things [women and sex] are of vital interest, and they [schoolboys] want to thrash them out with those who are at the same state of experience as themselves" (137). While this discussion is tame by modern standards, it was scandalous in 1914 to depict schoolboys speaking unabashedly about their own interest in sexuality. The longing for more open dialogue is echoed in Browne's and Hood's responses to Waugh's novel, as both writers single out sex education as an area requiring reform.

The novel takes place just before WWI and the Harrow staff obsessively toughens up pupils for the forecasted war through disciplinary structures that Lunn sees as facilitating the slaughter of a generation.[30] The novel follows the protagonist, Peter, throughout his four years at Harrow. Much like Rudyard Kipling's Stalky, Peter is an "un-athletic, intellectual hero unable to shine in the usual school way, [who] nonetheless plunges into all the rivalries and conflicts of school life and uses his weapons of brain against those of brawn" (Quigly 156). Peter's early childhood is "tolerably happy," with his life lived in books, especially school stories, that make him look "forward with passionate eagerness to school life as a delightful succession of intrigues, wars, and rumours of war" (Lunn 4). As a new student, Peter is unsure and unprepared to function within the "conform or be kicked" power structure of Harrow because it differs substantially from the public-school stories he had read and loved (Lunn 40).[31] Disappointed at the lack of midnight feasts and adventures, Peter "was not happy" because he "hated footer [football], and he lived in daily fear of being whopped [beaten]" (66-7). Peter openly confides his unhappiness during his correspondence with his uncle, who functions as the representational voice of the public-school Old Boy. Peter's uncle answers he is "sorry you [Peter] should find

---

[30] Lunn served during the First World War first with a Quaker Ambulance Unit in France in 1915. Upon Lunn's return home he was medically rejected for military service, and so he went to work in Mürren, Switzerland, in a Prisoner of War camp on behalf of French and British internees ("Lunn" *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*). The camp was the result of the 1914 agreement between Germany, France, Britain, Russia, and Belgium that made it possible for captured soldiers who were seriously wounded, but who were still capable of military work away from the front lines, to be repatriated in Switzerland.

[31] The only school story directly referenced is *Tom Brown's Schooldays;* otherwise, the subgenre is mentioned without specific examples. Lunn often pokes fun at Hughes's story, such as when one student asks if Thomas Arnold was "the chap who wrote the book all one's sisters sob over" (43), on which he is corrected: "No, he didn't write 'Tom Brown's Schooldays,' but he comes into it" (43). This section is not only indicative of the blurred boundaries between fiction and reality of what was Arnold's or Hughes's influence, but also undercuts the story by making it something one's sister cries over.

school anything less than the best time of your life" (67), and he begs Peter to realize "you're having the time of your li[fe], and don't forget it" (71). With his sadness invalidated and no hope of being removed from school, the athletics-hating Peter relies on his ability to manipulate others to accumulate power and status at Harrow.

The Tyranny of the Bloods

As has been the case since *Tom Brown's Schooldays*, education at Lunn's Harrow is less concerned with academics than moral lessons that form students' characters. Peter finds himself "in a society which demanded that he should adapt himself to their standards," which includes prizing "athletic prowess" over academic pursuits (41). The pedagogical structure of Harrow is satirically outlined in the fictional article "The Public School Spirit" by Mr. Handleby, which, early in Lunn's novel, a group of students read and debate. Mr. Handleby addresses critics who argue that "education and the more serious issues of life are neglected" at public schools, and he counters that "Public Schools aim at something higher than mere culture. They build up character and turn out the manly, clean living men that are the rock of empire" (59). While the boys mock the overt sentimentality of the article, they agree with its arguments and, further, "it does not so much matter what a man knows. It's what he is that signifies" (60). Mr. Handleby concludes his article with the invocation of the playing fields as the means and method of building character and churning out "clean living" men of empire:

> They [the playing fields] teach boys something which is more important than the classics. They teach them to play the game . . . [f]or it is precisely the discipline of the Playing Fields, the suppression of individual display in the interests of the side, it is precisely this

> spirit of disinterested loyalty that wins not only the *mimic warfare* of the playing field . . . but the *more real battles* on which England's glory depends. (60-1, emphasis added)

The teachers and students wholeheartedly support the notion that lessons learned on the playing fields provide students the moral education that creates men who will selflessly defend Britain and her interests. The narrator is less convinced of the merit of the playing fields, and rather than depicting "clean living" students and graduates, Lunn's characters smoke, drink, swear, and cheat without serious repercussions because these actions have little influence on their athletic performances. Rather than these behaviours preparing students for their adult careers, as Kipling depicted in *Stalky & Co*., Lunn finds this behaviour a sign of moral degradation in public schools precipitated by a focus on sports. At Harrow, students direct all their focus and energy into excelling at sports, which leaves them with little time for anything else. In depicting characters who fall short of the "clean living" ideal, Lunn argues that the playing field pedagogy contributes to the moral degradation of students rather than their purification.

Athletic ability and team performance are disciplinary apparatuses of the school space that hierarchize "good" and "bad" students in relation to one another, which is analogous to Michel Foucault's arguments that disciplinary space exercises over all "the pressure to conform to the same model, so that they might all be subjected to subordination, docility . . . so they might all be like one another" (Foucault 182). The playing field is a disciplinary space that "compares, differentiates, hierarchizes, [and] homogenizes" students and leads to the exclusion of those unable to conform to the normalizing process (Foucault 182-3). Lunn's narrator addresses the normalized disciplinary structures of the space directly by the indication that Harrow participates in the "tyranny of convention" by teaching "the lesson that the brilliant individualist is often a nuisance in the game of life. They train men to become efficient cogs in the social machinery"

(Lunn 40). Those who dominate on the fields punish and discipline those who do not, such as Peter, who "developed a permanent inward curve of the back induced by frequent and sudden movements to avoid a kick" (50). Physical strength is the easiest way to gain respect and power within the school, and the narrator explains that athletes are rulers of the houses, while the boys with brains can be "whopped at will" (165). The athletes' physical abuse of Peter is punishment for his failure to integrate into the whole and is an attempt to suppress his distinctiveness.

Success on the playing fields is the highest accomplishment, and this colours student success in terms of winning and losing and ensures that one side is always dominated by the other. It is a paradoxical education that simultaneously emphasizes community *and* competition and moulds future soldiers equally devoted to their comrades and defeating the enemy. Students are not differentiated according to "grade marks," but on their teams' "qualities, skills and aptitudes" that are a "great instrument of power . . . [that] indicates membership to the homogenous social body while also playing a part in classification, hierarchization and the distribution of rank" (Foucault 182, 184). Valuing winning directs student energies towards the fields, leaving little time or interest for education that aids in moral development, but that rather fosters an environment of corruption.

Peter's Machiavellian Domination

The playing fields are depicted by Lunn as corrupting students' characters by making them care about winning more than anything else. However, although Peter remains within his intellectual domain, he also uses his strength to dominate others, equally contributing to his moral degradation. Unlike the ideal products Mr. Handleby argued are manufactured by a public-school education, Lunn demonstrates the approved and applauded products of Harrow, a representative

of all public schools, to be either dim-witted and obedient soldiers or cunning and manipulative leaders.

Students who show an interest in their classroom subjects, as Peter initially does, are ostracized from the group. “Determined to know the worst,” Peter is questioned on his arrival at Harrow if he is a “scholar” (33). Peter concedes he is a scholar in history, and he is met with the insult that he is a “horrid little groise [hard worker]” who will be “a degger [disgrace] to the House” (33). Most of the students are fixated on the “trivial interests” of the playing fields to the “entire exclusion of all intellectual appeals” and shun those who put effort into academics (41). Students consider “footer” as the “real work of the place” (49), a sentiment supported by the school staff who believe the playing fields will prepare students to defend and expand the British Empire. The academic education provided at Harrow is considered by most students a distraction and impediment to the “real work” of footer. As a result, students put more effort into avoiding academic work than doing the work themselves. For Peter, the academic education offered at Harrow is considered (by Peter) as a two-fold failure: the classical education is outdated and mundane and even Peter becomes bored with the “hours of Greek and Latin every week” (121); and, of the possible time that could be spent on lessons, Peter instead “had to fag and play footer, both which I loathe” (121).

Peter comes to understand early “school life as one long warfare” (15), and if one cannot perform on the playing fields, he must learn to manipulate bodies off of them. Holt argues that Peter’s rise to power in his senior years demonstrates that the education at Harrow is not concerned with the acquisition of knowledge but the ability to adapt to one’s surroundings (221), which Peter does successfully by deciphering how to manipulate bodies within the school space. Harrow practises the monitorial system, and Peter is put in a “lawful” position of authority over

others in his senior years, including over "the lower school and the persons of everybody who was not a priv" (Lunn 165). However, as physical strength remains the gold standard for power and domination at Harrow, Peter must defend his power against the athletes. Rather than "earn" the respect of his peers, as is often the case in Golden Age public-school stories, it is through cunning and manipulation that Peter obtains domination and control over his peers.

Each chapter of the novel opens with an epigraph, two of which come from Niccoló Machiavelli's 1532 political treatise *The Prince.* It is no coincidence that Machiavellian quotations open the two chapters in which Peter masterfully manipulates his peers to imbue himself with greater power and authority. Peter recognizes "there are two methods of fighting, the one by law and the other by force" (Machiavelli qtd. in Lunn, 237). Though carrying the titles of prefect and Head Boy, Peter does not have the physical presence to enforce the power the titles supposedly afford, nor to differentiate himself above others holding the same titles. Thus, Peter goes to war against his peers using the law as his weapon. Peter convinces his house master, Mr. Lee, to remove "whopping privileges" from prefects, and that only Peter, as Head Boy, should legally have the power and authority to carry out physical discipline. With this move, Peter removes from the athletes their only insurance of power over himself and other students. Although the prefects are enraged by the change, they do not have the same cunning and knowledge of the law to manipulate Mr. Lee as Peter does, which creates a "dictatorship" in Peter's favour (256).

For Lunn, the Machiavellian and playing fields education are the two accurate pedagogies of the public-school which produces mindless drones (the athletes) or self-interested and self-serving individuals concerned with maintaining their own power and dominance (Peter), rather than a unified and self-sacrificing community. The narrator does not speak favourably of

either of the former options. Although Peter is the protagonist, his actions are not conveyed with glowing approval, but, rather, the narrator labels Peter a "prig" (129, 233), "magisterial" (168), and "prideful" (228). Likewise, the successes of the playing fields are established as hollow and foolish in the depictions of athletes as dim-witted and unable to think for themselves. Neither choice is appealing, and Lunn leaves the work of imagining alternatives to the reader, which is exactly what three young writers do.

Waugh's Reading Rebellion

Alec Waugh wrote *The Loom of Youth* (1917) at age seventeen in the two months between his leaving Sherborne School and his army deployment.[32] Waugh admits *Loom* is autobiographical, and in it he depicts irreligious and sexual schoolboys who unapologetically swear, crib, drink, smoke, gamble, and devote themselves fully to the playing fields. Like Lunn, Waugh considers these behaviours markers of moral degradation. The novel follows Gordon Caruthers through his four years at the fictional Fernhurst public school and Gordon's existential crisis regarding the values and characteristics that Fernhurst has entrenched in him. Gordon is initially "so proud of Fernhurst, with its grey cloisters and dreaming Abbey" (Waugh 84), but after reading Lunn's novel, *The Harrovians*, Gordon comes to believe his school's emphasis on games and the suppression of critical thinking is largely responsible for the great loss of life in the war and for the deterioration of Britain's moral state. During his fourth year, Gordon finds himself at the top of the schoolboy power-hierarchy, but he is the last of his generation in the school as the rest have come of age and enlisted, and thus Gordon's privileges feel empty and meaningless.

[32] The novel was published on 20 July 1917, during which time Waugh was serving as a machine-gunner in Flanders.

Hearing the names of his esteemed peers on the casualty lists, and being continually told by his teachers, "[i]f you aren't good at games you'll be useless in the trenches" (163), Gordon comes to question the value of the education he has received. Gordon finds himself trapped in the tyranny of the norm in which he is valued only as a cog in a bigger, national, soldier-producing machine. For all his peers who excelled at games, was dying in the trenches all they were being prepared for?

Claudia Nelson argues that the shock value of *Loom* comes not from its "revelation" that schoolboys can be prone to irreligion, homosexuality, cribbing because books like "*Eric* had said the same sixty years earlier," but the controversy came from the "realism that could not be denied" (85). Parker further argues that the novel caused such a furore because it attacked the public-school system during war, "in which the schools were proving themselves and vindicating their ethos in the trenches" (20). Waugh was an adolescent writing shortly after leaving school and was witness to the toll the trenches was taking on his generation. Like Lunn, he presented an unsentimental view of public school and his youthful age forced readers to consider the accusations of the public system's faults seriously, which is what Parker calls the "crux" of the novel's controversy: "[N]obody would have minded if Waugh had confined his criticism to the curriculum, but to attack the 'social training' which was at that time producing splendid officers was unforgivable" (21).

In *Loom*'s 1954 edition preface, Waugh explains that he was in a "nostalgic" and "rebellious" mood when writing the novel (10). In 1915, Waugh was at the top of Sherborne School: he was a house captain, prefect, top batsman of the elevens, and had just won the English verse prize. At this height of schoolboy achievement, Waugh was accused of a sexual relationship with another student. Rather than expel him, the headmaster strongly suggested

Waugh's father remove him from the school to avoid the shame of expulsion. Several house masters felt this was not an appropriate sentence and organized a boycott to have Waugh expelled. However, two masters stood by Waugh, including the aforementioned S. P. B. Mais, and Waugh was able to finish out the term with their support. He avoided an official expulsion, but Waugh still left school a year earlier than planned and felt he had been "prematurely ejected from paradise," and as he waited to join the army he was "consumed with longing for Sherborne and resentful that his time there had been curtailed" (Richards 230). Though Waugh admits he "intensely" enjoyed his time at public-school, he was in "constant conflict with authority," because of its "inability or refusal to recognize the true nature of school life" ("Preface" 10). Waugh was frustrated by the myth of the schoolboy, that he "[i]n no sense had incarnated such a myth" ("Preface" 10), and was regularly irritated by what he believed to be unrealistic expectations for himself and his peers.

In the 1954 preface, Waugh contends that prior to WWI, "Britain's imperial destiny was never questioned, and the Public School system as a bulwark of Empire was held sacrosanct," and thus never had the "inevitable emotional consequences of a monastic herding together" of children and adolescents in public schools been questioned ("Preface" 12). Waugh attributes much of the corruption and impurity festered in the school space as a result of the "monastic herding," or the enclosure of the school space. The isolated microcosm of public schools was traditionally heralded as the means by which students' moral education and character formation were undertaken, but Waugh (again like Lunn) argues that an immoral education is what is truly fostered in the enclosure. While Waugh criticizes several disciplinary structures of public school, most ardently that of the playing fields, it is the enclosure of the space that Waugh believes most contributes to students' moral degradation.

Gordon's Early Education

Like the Golden Age protagonists previously discussed, Gordon is initially enamoured with the school space, and his descriptions of the physical space are overladen with emotionality. The space is aesthetically "glamourous" and can "waken a wonderful sense of the beautiful" within its pupils, which is the case for Gordon, who, when first "gazing from the school gateway across the grey ivy-clad studies was taken for a few moments clean outside himself" (5). First beholding the material school space provides an out-of-body experience for Gordon and constructs his initial interaction to be a spiritual experience. He immediately begins the transformation from individual (he is taken out of himself) to a member of the collective. In Gordon's case, affect is intricately linked to the space of Fernhurst which impresses upon Gordon to, as Sara Ahmed describes affect's effects, "shape the 'surface' of the individual" (*Politics* 1).

The glamour of the space is in truth a façade, and the students are not transformed into innocent cherubs, but rather take up irreligious behaviour without punishment because their energies are focused on sports rather than their moral development. Waugh's depiction of sinful schoolboys is not novel, as these behaviours (smoking, swearing, drinking, cribbing) were common in Golden Age school stories. However, in Victorian school stories (with the exception of *Stalky & Co.*) students are either expelled from the space for their sins or recast and purified in the public-school kiln as "clean living" men and women. Student behaviours such as drinking, smoking, and swearing are portrayed in most of these early texts as the fault of the individual, and the school acts as a remedy to cure students of vice. Nelson notes,

> If the worst elements of the adult world occasionally wormed their way . . . into this childish Eden, that we can so easily penetrate their disguises to establish that these boys differ from their peers merely underscores the essential innocence of the rest of the idyll. (63-4)

Vice is yet another form of safe rebellion within the genre that does not challenge the power structures of the school, but rather reinforces them in that students "best learned to conquer evil by experiencing it" and those unable to purge themselves of sin are expelled from the space (Nelson 65). The "cleansing" education of public schools is absent in Waugh's and Lunn's depictions; rather, the typical English public-school student is shown to be "impure, ambitious, dishonest, ill-educated, irreligious, and shallow" (Nelson 85). The fault for such character development lies not with the individual and his "innately sinful nature," but with the school for teaching "it is the surface and not the substance that counts" through an emphasis on sports (Nelson 86).

Upon arrival at Fernhurst, Gordon is described as "innocent" (*Loom* 26, 30, 39), but he is slowly corrupted by the school environment. By the end of his first week at school, Gordon discovers "the sure way to popularity lay in success on the field," and as he yearns "with a wild longing for power and popularity" he dedicates himself to the playing fields to integrate himself into the community (15). Gordon realizes that the "laws ceased to exist" for members of the football team, and that "at Fernhurst they [games] seemed the one thing that mattered. To the athletes all things are forgiven" (15). Fully devoted to becoming an integral member of the school community, Gordon soon finds it impossible "to think of anything but house matches" (25), and he and his peers go to great lengths to avoid school work that detracts from their

athletic goals. Corrupt behaviour arises from the students' commitment to the fields which leaves little time for anything else.

The corruption of "innocent" Gordon is best depicted in the decline of his academic pursuits. As an innocent new student, Gordon is horrified to hear his peers speak so openly of cheating on lessons and exams, but he comes to see cribs as a necessity to allocate more time to athletics. He studies in the first semester without the use of cribs, and wins the Term's Prize with "pure, unalloyed joy" (23). But the enclosed school creates a mob mentality between students, and behaviours that Gordon previously had condemned become normalized and quickly incorporated into his own behaviour; witnessing the widespread and accepted practice of cheating, he begins using cribs in his second semester (26). There are few consequences for students' cheating and cribbing, as Fernhurst creates an environment in which cribs are approved in valuing athletic performance far above academics. The use of cribs is not portrayed as an obviously corrupt behaviour that underscores the innocence of others who valiantly refuse, such as Arthur in *Tom Brown*, who on his sickbed makes Tom vow to stop cribbing to honour Arthur's memory, should he die. In *Loom* cribbing is presented as a common and accepted practice of the majority. The students' successful methods of excusing cheating, and recasting the action as right in that it frees up time to practise sports provides evidence of the school's degrading influence on the moral characters of students.

The moral degradation that follows from a focus on athletics and a classical education is best made evident, though disturbingly, when a sexual relationship between students is discovered by the Headmaster. Most likely a cathartic chapter for Waugh in relation to the accusations made against him while at Sherborne, the narrator subtly references a sexual relationship between students as proof of the moral deficit Fernhurst's education provokes.

During Gordon's first year, his friend Jeffries is abruptly expelled when the Headmaster "found out all about me and Fitzroy" (29). That Jeffries and Fitzroy had a sexual relationship is strongly implied in Jeffries' and his peers' omissions and inability to directly name what the two are accused of. For example, Gordon asks, "I never thought there was really anything in *that*" (29, emphasis mine), and Mansell is unable to even verbalize the accusation: "you have to go just because—Oh, it's damn unfair" (29). Gordon's subtle language and Mansell's omission strongly imply a sexual relationship between Jeffries and Fitzroy. As with cribs, Waugh casts this "corrupt behaviour" not as evidence of an individual's sin, but as the fault of the school. Hearing of his expulsion, Jeffries's peers clear him of any blame, and he most clearly recuses himself of his actions in the emotional exclamation:

> Who made me what I am but Fernhurst? Two years ago I came here as innocent as [Gordon] Caruthers there; never knew anything. Fernhurst taught me everything; Fernhurst made me worship games, and think that they alone matter, and everything else could go to the deuce. I heard men say about bloods whose lives were an open scandal, 'Oh, it's all right, they can play football.' (30)

While this episode is disturbing in defining homosexuality as a "situational behaviour" and a sign of moral degradation, it is nonetheless significant in Jeffries's blame of Fernhurst's emphasis on athletics (a focus on the surface) as being responsible for his perceived moral degradation. Jeffries asserts it is the space of the school, not the individual, which is at fault for moral decay. However, Jeffries's peers are too entrenched in the system to seriously contemplate his accusation against the school, and soon after he exits the study, they retract their support and scorn him for speaking against athletics: "What a fool that man Jeffries is, getting bunked, and mucking up the grovel. Damned ass, the man is" (30). Jeffries's "mucking up the grovel," or his

criticism of athletics, is not fully understood by Gordon, and it is the reading experience of *The Harrovians* that opens his heart to the truth of Jeffries's accusations.[33]

Gordon's Transformative Reading Experience

For Gordon, it is the everyday and common practice of reading (both poetry and Lunn's *The Harrovians*) that defamiliarizes his experience of Fernhurst to enable Gordon's comprehension of the disciplinary structures and his quiet manipulation of them through active living and making meaningful choices. The first shift occurs when Gordon's roommate reads aloud Charles Swinburne's *Atalanta in Calydon* (1865), and Gordon is confronted with "beauty" that he had not known existed (81). Fernhurst offers a "classical" education which cannot compete with the "beauty" of Shelley, Keats, Byron, Tennyson, Swinburne, and Rossetti, all of whom Gordon starts to read obsessively. In conjunction with the lessons of poetry, reading Lunn's *The Harrovians* ignites Gordon's existential crisis and exposes Gordon to the empty lessons of public schools' moral pedagogy.

Lunn's *The Harrovians* had an unquestionable influence on Waugh's construction of the school space in *Loom*. Waugh's handbook for public schoolboys, *Public School Life* (1922), opens with a dedicatory letter to Lunn. Waugh reflects on 1914 when *The Harrovians* was the "most borrowed book in the house" and hours were spent "in eager discussions of your book"

[33] Jeffries remains an influential figure during Gordon's reconsideration of the school space. During his conversations with teacher Ferrers, he tells Gordon, "they [students] get wrong impressions shoved into their heads, cease to think at all, lose all sense of honesty and morality. Then the school that has made them like this finds out what they are, and sends them away," to which Gordon replies "By Jove, that's just what Jeffries said" (214). During his fourth year, Gordon reads Jeffries's name on the casualty lists and is saddened to see all he is remembered for by other students as being "a fine forward" (250), inspiring Gordon once again to question if there is a better legacy to leave behind than one's performance on the playing fields.

(v). Waugh explains that the novel was a "revelation" to the schoolboys because "[i]t explained us to ourselves" (v). For Waugh, reading *The Harrovians* was a significant force encounter that impressed upon him in such a way that he learns about himself and his role as a public-school student. Waugh includes the revolutionary experience of reading *The Harrovians* in *Loom* as Gordon's reading of it ignites his existential crisis. *The Harrovians* "strip[s] school life of sentiment" (*Loom* 84), and defamiliarizes Fernhurst, which begins Gordon's process of critically reconsidering the public-school space.

De Certeau describes reading as an everyday practice and subversive tactic that produces without exploiting or taking something over, that poaches and appropriates spaces in which "a different world (the reader's) slips into the author's place" (xxi). Gordon slips into Lunn's space of Harrow as presented in *The Harrovians*, and in the act of reading Gordon functions like a renter who "transforms another person's property into a space borrowed" and makes "comparable changes in an apartment they furnish with their acts and memories" (xxi). Readers do not take "the position of the author" (169), but Gordon's personal memories make his experience of reading *The Harrovians* completely his own. In his reading of Lunn, Gordon furnishes the space with his own experience at Fernhurst in that he "had judged the book by his own [Gordon's] experiences" (Waugh 84). Facilitated in the act of reading, Gordon compares the place of the novel to that in which he physically resides and considers Fernhurst with a new lens. Gordon worries his prior damnation of "the Public School system because he thought it had done harm to Fernhurst" was incorrect, and that perhaps "Fernhurst and not the system were at fault" (84). Stimulated by his reading experience, Gordon struggles to answer the question, is the fault with the public-school system at large, or Fernhurst? In his attempt to find an answer, the space of Fernhurst is defamiliarized as Gordon considers it with a fresh focus. One evening, as Gordon

grapples with the questions stirred by his reading, he is struck by "the evening sun steeping the gravel courts in shadows" and the "lights flickering behind the study panes" (85). When witnessing the school grounds darkened by the setting sun,

> [I]t came home to him with a poignant vividness that Fernhurst, which should have been the home of dreams and of ideas, had, by the inefficiency of a vacillating system, become immersed in petty intrigues, and was filled with a generation that was being taught to blind itself to the higher issues. (85)

This episode illustrates how the school space (both the materiality and the organization of the space) is defamiliarized for Gordon because of his reading of Lunn's novel, and this defamiliarization facilities his burgeoning apprehension of how the school space works upon student bodies.

Inspired by his reading, Gordon inhabits Fernhurst in ways that run counter to its disciplinary aims. In his senior years, Gordon chooses to major in History because it has been taught at Fernhurst "the same from time immemorial" (137), and is the easiest subject to master because prior students have left behind detailed cribs to Master Finnemore's assignments and exams, which he does not alter from year to year. A History major is a meaningful choice on Gordon's part for it opens up time to read contemporary poetry and prose. Finding the offered academic education at Fernhurst lacklustre, Gordon takes an active role in the direction and aims of his own education by spending hours reading poetry and prose, which the narrator praises as "incidentally doing himself far more good than he would have done by binding himself down to the classical regime, which trained boys to imitate, and not to strike out on their own" (138). Gordon lives actively at Fernhurst by pursuing knowledge outside the offered curricula that

stimulates his critical thought, which, as the narrator points out, paints Gordon as an outlier in the space rather than the desired obedient and loyal follower.

De Certeau contends that conversation is another everyday practice that can offer the dominated the means of subverting, manipulating, and rebelling against space, and Gordon partakes in this everyday resistance with a new young master, Ferrers (most likely based on Mais), who shares many of Gordon's newly formed opinions. The friendship provides Gordon the space in which to work through his struggles with a more seasoned rebel. Ferrers presents himself as a comrade to Gordon during a Stoics (school club) debate concerning whether a classical or modern education is best for the school. Ferrers speaks passionately for thirty minutes and verbalizes much of what Gordon has internally wrestled with alone since his reading of Lunn. Ferrers argues for a modern education, for the classics produce men who "do very well in Foreign Offices, but they can't think," and he charges that "the best men never went to a Public School" (95). Many students are scandalized by this speech, but Gordon admires the new master "who had banged into the cloistered Fernhurst life bubbling over with the ideas of the rising generation, intolerant of prejudice and tradition, clamorous for reform" (115).

The conversations between Ferrers and Gordon start with their readings of *The Harrovians* and how it relates to Fernhurst and continues into further conversations that all challenge the current disciplinary structures of the school. Master Ferrers is frustrated with the public-school system's failure to deal with "human nature" and often sends articles about the failures of public schools to London papers in which he "raved against the weakness of the authorities" (134). Ferrers reassures Gordon in his new apprehension that the school space focuses on superficial character development with the classical curriculum and emphasis on games, which ultimately weakens the moral character of students. Ferrers and Gordon reform

and appropriate the teacher-student relationship within the space of Fernhurst to include revolutionary conversations that push Gordon to think critically and engage directly in his education.

In his last days at Fernhurst, both Gordon and Ferrers are despondent that they are the only ones to see the failures of the school. Devastated by the mounting casualty lists that catalogue recent Fernhurst graduates, Gordon and Ferrers come to believe the losses are a direct result of public-school education's promotion of blind obedience instead of critical thinking. As a last effort to make changes to the school space, the two host a Stoics Club debate on the "Values of Athletics." Ferrers opens the debate with the plea: "How much longer . . . are we going to waste our time, our energy, our force on kicking a football?" (164). Gordon contributes by noting, "[N]o one works at Public School. People who do are despised. . . . Games don't win battles, but brains do, and brains aren't trained on the footer field" (166). The two make an "impression" upon those listening, and a vote is passed that makes games no longer compulsory. The debate is an act of rebellion that succeeds in challenging the key disciplinary tactic of Fernhurst. This victory initially fills Gordon with joy because he believes he has begun to change Fernhurst, but he ultimately feels that the revolution has been "written upon water" (166), as this change is achieved on the eve of his graduation and with many of the rebels leaving the school for good.

Most of Gordon's self-directed study, driven by his thirst for knowledge, takes place during his last year, such as the above debate, and Gordon fears too much of his time was wasted on sports. Gordon falls into a dark depression on the eve of his graduation:

> And when he began to sum up his achievements, he was forced to own that most of them were athletic triumphs, and athletics meant little to him. He had long ceased to worship

> them. Because a man could make a big score in a House match, it did not mean that he was in any way fit for the battle of life; and what else had he done? (176)

Though many at the school congratulate Gordon and hail him as a success, he "felt himself that he had failed" (178). His melancholy when considering his time at school acts as a cautionary tale to readers and constructs the novel as another decoder for spatial codes as *The Harrovians* did for Waugh. *Loom* contains revolutionary sentiments that suggest readers pursue "true education" early rather than being swept up in the tyranny of games.

Loom's Reception

Loom was reprinted five times between July and September 1917, making it a major success, received well by readers and initially by critics. In August 1917, the *Spectator* hailed the novel "a picture of the twentieth-century schoolboy by himself" and "a revolutionary work—if only the parents of England will read it" (qtd. in Musgrave 189). Those on the grounds of public schools were not, however, as receptive. On September 1917, when the new school year began, many students were ordered from the pulpits that the book was not allowed on school property, and students were also cautioned against reading it at home. Perhaps the most offended was Waugh's Sherborne School, who removed his *and* his father's name from the list of the Old Boys' society in 1917. Students skirted around the ban of the novel, and there are reports of students smuggling copies into their schools (Musgrave 190). Students who read the banned book were living actively, making meaningful choices, and subverting adult authority in their school spaces.

In November 1917, the *Spectator* published an article by an anonymously named "Mere Schoolmaster" who claimed that school stories like Waugh's were no longer for schoolboys, but "the chief weapon in the armoury of those who assail the Public School System" (qtd. in

Musgrave 190). Following December 1917, any lingering good graces towards *Loom* faded, and heavy hitters came out in force to attack the novel.[34] A paper by Edward Lyttelton, previously the headmaster of Eton (1905-1916), contended that *Loom* was "almost wholly untrue. . . . [W]hatever is wrong with our Public Schools is the outcome of certain defects of the English character" (qtd. in Musgrave 190). Lyttelton claimed that public schools were more important than ever because of the social training they could provide in times of war. More subtly, the articles by Lyttelton and other anonymous Headmasters and teachers attempted to undercut the validity of students being the authorities on public schools and reinstated the traditional representations of the public-school space (written by Old Boys) as the authentic accounts.

Two Public-Schoolboy Replies

In 1919, two seventeen-year-old public-school boys published polemic replies to Waugh's *Loom*. Martin Browne's *A Dream of Youth, an Etonian's Reply to "The Loom of Youth"* aimed to "answer on constructive lines to the outcry against the Public Schools, which is headed by Mr.

[34] The general expiration of good-will for *Loom* may have been linked to the Bolsheviks' "October" Revolution in The Empire of Russia (at the time, Russia followed the Julian calendar, so according to the Gregorian calendar, the revolution took place in November 1917). On November 7th the Bolsheviks seized control of the Petrograd (capital of the Russian Empire), and on November 8th they took control of the Winter Palace (residence of the royal family). The insurrections resulted in ousting the Provincial government, and the declaration of the new communist government with Vladimir Lenin as the head. The revolution was one of the most explosive political events of the twentieth century, formed the first communist state, and led the country to civil war (Read, "Revolutions"). The successful revolution led by rebels terrified much of Europe, and many feared similar political upheavals in their own countries. *Loom's* criticism of the elite public-school system, a bulwark of British society, was considered dangerous by those in positions of authority who were fearful of similar revolutions in Britain. Waugh's publisher, Grant Richards, ran an advertisement in the *Times Literary Supplement* in December 2017 that read, "Really if paper and print were at its old price I should print an anthology of reviews of *The Loom of Youth*" (qtd. in Musgrave 190), that signals the volume of criticism that *Loom* received post-November.

Alec Waugh's book" (19). Jack Hood, who chose a pseudonym and does not name his school, insists in *The Heart of a Schoolboy* that if a fair view of public schools is to be made, it "must be written from the heart of a Public Schoolboy *still at and enveloped in the system*, which condition I fulfil" (3-4, emphasis added). Just as Lunn argued for the authenticity of his account with his diary, both Browne and Hood insist their accounts are worth consideration because of their age and status as students. While both replies are framed with the intention of defending the public-school tradition, they imagine alternative pedagogical practices that would reform the public-school system.

That both authors even read *Loom* demonstrates their attempt to live actively in their school spaces, and that they made meaningful and rebellious choices in reading a widely banned book. While it is not known where Hood attended school, Browne attended Eton. *Loom* was directly attacked in 1917 by Lyttelton, who had been Browne's headmaster in 1916, and the chances are great that Browne read a smuggled copy of the novel. It can be assumed that Hood's unnamed school was likewise critical of *Loom*, and that Hood may have also had to undertake secret practices to read the book. Like Waugh and his character Gordon, Hood and Browne thus appropriate the school space through the everyday experience of reading and writing.

Both authors initially position themselves as defenders against what they perceived as Waugh's attack against public schools. For Browne, the products public schools generate are the greatest selling point of the space, and he cites that during "the crisis of this war [WWI] . . . it was the leadership of the Public School men that chiefly saved the situation. Their unique qualities of character are testified to by all" (22). Hood is in agreement with Browne and further demonstrates that he has internalized the public-school ethos in the declaration that the pedagogies of the schools develop "self-control, obedience, courage, and a hundred other manly

qualities" (Hood 26). As their accounts progress, the division between Browne, Hood and Waugh evaporate as the authors argue that public schools "need, and can stand, change and reform" (Hood 11), and that "reform is necessary" (Browne 26). Conceding that public schools need reform is a challenge to the current structures of the school space. The public-school spaces Browne and Hood describe are far from idealized, but both authors are adamant that an ideal could be met if their calls for reform are implemented: "I feel ground for hope . . . that Eton will be fully prepared to lead the way in the march of progress" (Browne 27). The two authors see the potential for the schools to produce loyal, obedient, and chivalrous men, but that these traits could be better instilled and might not be universally met in every school. Browne and Hood go further than calling for reform to outlining detailed plans for reform with evidence for why such reforms should be implemented. They position themselves as figures of authority in their status as public-school students, and this disturbs the distribution of power and authority in school spaces.

Hood and Browne agree that their religious, secular, and "womanhood" educations are lacking, and the underdevelopment in these areas fosters immorality. Concerning sexuality, both authors make the "scandalous" arguments that topics pertaining to sexuality and women need to be more transparent, students should be allowed to ask questions, and that the current system of secrecy fosters immoral behaviour and the mistreatment of women. Browne notes that schoolboys "pick up scraps of information" regarding sexuality and women, but these scraps are "generally distorted, and [we] learn to think of 'women' as an exciting, immoral influence" (64). In women and sex being made a forbidden and mysterious fruit, the writers argue that students seek what has been made exciting through secrecy. They counter that if students were given clear accounts of women and sex, both would be made less mysterious and less desirable (Browne 64-

6, Hood 48-50). Though highly questionable that either sexual curiosity and desire could be curbed with clearer lessons, that the authors argue for candid information that invites students' questions is a far departure from the silence traditionally practised. In this case, Hood and Browne call for an education that includes students as active participants, rather than passive receptacles.

More scandalous than the new sexual education program are the authors' arguments that any immorality of public-school students is the fault of *adults*, not children and youth. This is a radical argument in line with sentiments expressed in Lunn's and Waugh's novels that reconstructs the school space as an enclosed microcosm that purifies the corruption of adult society into a space in which adult corruption festers. Holt notes that "most writers tend to see the adolescent as an isolated entity, generating his own problems and immoralities" (229), but Browne and Hood reverse the accusation, and place the adolescent student directly under society's influence. Browne argues that student immorality is the fault of adult society (59), and states that "if you treat the state of national morals which has lately been revealed with prudish cowardice so far characteristic with your dealings with it, you cannot expect anything very much better from the Public Schools" (60). Browne also argues that immorality and violence are introduced into public schools because students learn them at home: if a boy is a bully and physically abusive, this behaviour most likely had been demonstrated by his father. Here the blame is on adults for introducing immorality into the schools, not on schoolboys for succumbing to their "innately" sinful natures while at school. Hood likewise looks to society at large, especially cheap theatre and penny dreadfuls, and asks how society can expect moral schoolboys if they are fed a steady diet of "trashy novels" (37). These arguments excuse the school space from contributing to the immoral behaviour of schoolboys because the behaviour is

learnt at home and brought to school. However, the authors also portray the public schools as unable to successfully combat the immorality brought into the space through the deficient disciplinary structures and outdated education programs. Unlike Lunn and Waugh, Browne and Hood argue that immorality is not bred at the school, but (as Lunn and Waugh also show) the two responses show public schools to be unable to provide a moral education to counter immorality.

Browne and Hood speak directly to Waugh's depiction of the tyranny of athletics and argue that his account is not representative of their experience. The authors again present their arguments as being in direct defiance to Waugh, but on closer inspection they support his ideas. While maintaining that Waugh's account is not representative of their experience, they admit there is truth to Waugh's account (Brown 52) because "the average boy in prep. school likes games above anything else. That is Nature" (Hood 21), and that obsession is the fault of the school, not the student. Both accounts argue that younger students often devote more time to games than studies, and while this supports Waugh's depiction, the authors argue this devotion is beneficial to younger students and only harmful (and the fault of the school) if sustained past the fifth form. Browne makes the typical argument that games are valuable to students' character formation in developing traits of obedience, loyalty, and team spirit— as well as physical exercise being essential to work off the excess energy of growing bodies. Hood agrees with Browne and adds that for younger students, "athletics will probably keep him straighter than too much book-worming and indoor work" (22). Hood's arguments depict a transformation between fourth and fifth form, in which younger students do not yet have the moral complexity to understand and appreciate art and literature. Once they enter the fifth form, students suddenly have the maturity to appreciate academic subjects and consequently (and naturally) will spend

less time on the playing fields. Hood uses the many literary reviews published at public schools by fifth-and sixth-form students as proof of the academic maturity present in the upper forms. Hood does not explain what takes place between the fourth and fifth form that develops this transformation, and thus makes this described universal change of interest suspect. Hood's arguments are typical of the public-school ethos that pervades British society of the school space having a transformative effect upon the moral development of students, without including the tactics (outside simply inhabiting the space) through which the transformation is achieved.

For students in the fifth and sixth forms who *do* devote themselves to games rather than studies, both Hood and Browne blame public schools for the fixation. Browne argues that athletic obsession is "due not to athletics but to educational faults in the school" (54), and Hood contends that "if some boys live for nothing but for athletics, then it is simply because 'work' is not made interesting" (27). Browne and Hood, much as Lunn and Waugh do, place the blame for student devotion to sports on public schools' antiquated education that prohibits student engagement with academics and critical thinking. In their criticism of Waugh's novel, Browne and Hood align themselves with arguments made in *Loom* that students are attracted to the playing fields because the classrooms are dull. Brown's and Hood's arguments against athletics are embodied in Gordon's journey and everyday practice of reading: Gordon is initially devoted to the playing fields because of the emphasis his school places on achievements made there, rather than the dull and outdated academic lessons. Gordon subverts the disciplinary structures of his school space by pursuing subjects that interest him, thereby granting himself autonomy. Gordon's journey is exemplified in Hood's and Browne's requests for more student autonomy in lessons so that individual interests may be pursued, and that in allowing this autonomy unhealthy devotion to the playing fields would cease.

Hood's condemnation goes beyond games to military drills. Guarded with his criticism for fear of being thought "unpatriotic or a pacifist," Hood nonetheless questions why "Army discipline" is thought to teach "self-control, obedience, and the feeling that one is but a unit in the whole" better than other disciplinary structures of the school (25). Hood argues that sports already teach self-control and obedience, and that the public school itself develops "the feeling that one is but a unit in the whole" (26), which makes military drills a superfluous and suppressive method of discipline. Hood exclaims, "[W]e are not yet men" and should be playing the games that "bring out self-control, obedience, courage, and a hundred other manly qualities without in any way suppressing one's spirits" (26). Hood concludes his argument with the last verse of Henry Newbolt's poem "Vitai Lampada":

> This is the word that year by year,
>
> While in her place the school is set,
>
> Every one of her sons must hear,
>
> And none that hears it dare forget;
>
> This they all with a joyful mind
>
> Bear through life like a torch of flame,
>
> And falling fling to the host behind—
>
> 'Play up! play up! and play the game!' (Newbolt qtd. in Hood 29)

Hood concludes his section on athletics with this poem to defend his argument that games prepare boys for war better than military drills. Lunn and Waugh perceive games as moulding schoolboys into unquestioning cogs in the war machine, but Hood is proud of how the games prepare schoolboys for war. Hood considers the First World War as proof of Britain's need of the public schools' products. While Hood's arguments are conservative and largely supportive of

the public-school ethos which produces mindless soldiers who blindly follow orders, he is subversive in including his own voice into the debate by condemning military drills.

The foundation of Browne's and Hood's reforms is student autonomy, which facilitates an education that comes closer to the "true education" and that is driven by critical thinking (Hood 51, Browne 74). Holt notes that Browne and Hood plead for "moral and civic education to be a dynamic, two-way process" and for "emotional manipulation that currently dominates the education field" to be abandoned (Holt 232). Mais was impassioned by the two youths' accounts and agreed that students should have more autonomy in their educations, especially in that civics should be included in the curriculum. However, the ideal dreamt of in these responses never materialized. Browne's and Hood's accounts remain significant, but isolated, incidents as post-World War I there was "no great outpouring of adolescent literary effort to show educationalists the way of the future" (Holt 232). Holt argues there may be several reasons why no revolution followed: young men may not have had the sustained willpower to continue campaigning after witnessing so many of their generation die, and with the likelihood of a Labour government being elected, from the top of British society moves were made to stifle political activism that quelled feelings of revolution and reform (232). Parker likewise argues that the British and Commonwealth publics desired reassurance that "in the face of more than a million deaths . . . it had all been worthwhile" (27), and this need for reassurance did not admit dissent or reform. Even with the principally positive tracts of Browne and Hood who argue for the potential of a successful reformation and revival of the public-school system, more accounts by public-school students were not published, and no pedagogical reformations were made in the public schools.

Conclusion

The First World War saw the apotheosis of the public school's purpose; however, late in the war and post-war what the schools stood for began to be questioned, perhaps most critically and loudly in the youth-authored works discussed in this section. These texts demonstrate that the everyday and ordinary act of reading, as represented by their characters, and as conducted by actual readers, can generate subversive strategies that provides a way for bodies with minimal power to manipulate and appropriate the spaces they inhabit. Writing is, of course, another subversive and rebellious tactic in which all four authors engage. Through their writing, these youth authors position themselves as authorities on the public-school space and argue for the inclusion of youth in their own educations. Significantly, the many critical reviews by adults of all four texts attempted to stop any youth rebellions by undercutting their authority and denying that their accounts were authentic. To deny the texts' accuracy was a power-move that reclaimed adult authority over school spaces and ensured the system would endure undisturbed so that students would continue to flock obediently to enlist or defend the nation in the future. The texts demonstrate how much power is at stake within the space of school, and these authors represent a brief period within the school story genre in which youth temporarily tipped the scales of power and challenged the disciplinary structures of their school spaces. The following chapter continues an examination of school stories based on historical events, although this time adults write of their own, a family member's, or a fictional composite's traumatic experience of attending a Canadian Residential School. Like the youth-authored school stories and polemic treatises, the following group of school stories are powerful political statements that intercede in the politically charged school space to restructure, or at least unsettle, settler Canadian hegemonic society.

Chapter Three

Picturing Canadian Residential Schools:

"Survivance" and "Unsettling" the Master Settler Narrative

> "I seen this big monster of a building. . . . I've always called it a monster, I still do today, because of not the size of it, but because of the things that happened there."
>
> —Calvin Myersion, TRC, "The Survivors Speak"

British public schools and Golden Age public-school stories attempted to imbue characteristics of loyalty and obedience. The schools and stories were colonial tools that outfitted students in preparation for British colonial projects at home and abroad. Schools were likewise an imperial tool *in* British colonies as education was used to indoctrinate the colonized, as Nugugi wa Thiong'o succinctly describes, "The night of the sword and the bullet was followed by the morning of the chalk and blackboard. The physical violence of the battlefield was followed by the psychological violence of the classroom" (9). Rather than reinforce the local cultural values of students, colonial schools aimed to detach students from their societies. The schools did not intend to prepare students for leadership roles in their local society, or to maintain their social positions, but to fit these "students into a world different from the one in which they were born" (Altbach and Kelly, 3), and to acclimatize students into subservient roles that best served the needs of colonizers. Canadian Residential Schools (known in Canada as "Indian Residential Schools" and hereafter referred to as IRS) were a colonial weapon that served the needs of colonizers.[35]

---

[35] Chelsea Vowel performs important work in *Indigenous Writes* (2016) of dissecting the terms used to refer to Indigenous peoples and non-Indigenous Canadians. Vowel defends her use of "Indigenous" in explaining it has "international connotations, referring to Indigenous peoples through the world rather than being country-specific" (17). For non-Indigenous peoples, Vowel

To eschew their legal and financial obligations to Indigenous peoples and gain control over Indigenous land and resources, the Canadian government implemented policies that attempted to eliminate Indigenous peoples as distinct groups and assimilate them into settler culture (TRC, "Summary" 3). The IRS were an "integral part" of these policies and performed cultural genocide that severed children's familial and cultural connections to "prevent the transmission of cultural values and identity from one generation to the next" (TRC, "Summary" 1). Beginning in the late nineteenth century, IRS were founded and operated through a church and state partnership that continued throughout the schools' long history in Canada.[36] The schools were born from the goal of Canada's first Prime Minister, Sir. John A. MacDonald (who served from 1867-1873 and 1878-1891): "to do away with the tribal system and assimilate the Indian people in all respects with the inhabitants of the Dominion, as speedily as they are fit to change" (MacDonald qtd. in Milloy and Edwards 6).

In 1887, Deputy Superintendent General of Indian Affairs L. Vankoughnet determined that MacDonald's national goal could be achieved through "a persistent continuance in a thoroughly systematic course of educating . . . the children, [only then] will the final hoped and long striven for result be attained" (qtd. in Milloy and Edwards 7). In the now infamous *Davin Report* (1879), Nicholas Flood Davin spoke glowingly of the American and British industrial schools and advised the Canadian federal government that day schools would fail to assimilate students because "the influence of the wigwam was stronger than the influence of the school" (Davin 1). Following this

---

uses "settler" not as a racial marker, but a relational term to refer to "non-Indigenous people living in Canada who form the European-descended sociopolitical majority" (24). The term highlights that people continue to settle in Canada and that colonialism continues. I take Vowel's lead, as well as the practice of many current scholars, and will also use "Indigenous" and "settler" throughout this chapter.

[36] John Milloy argues the schools officially began in Canada in 1879 (xiii).

report, the Department of Indian Affairs reported in 1890 that the only effective model of education was one in which children were separated from their families:

> It would be highly desirable . . . to obtain entire *possession* of all Indian children after they attain the age of seven or eight years, and [to] *keep* them at schools . . . until they have had a thorough course of instruction. (qtd. in Milloy 7, emphasis added)

Thus, the Canadian residential boarding school was born: to obtain possession of Indigenous children they were stolen from their families and communities and kept in the schools to intentionally "minimize and weaken family ties and cultural linkages, and to indoctrinate children into a new culture—the culture of the legally dominant Euro-Christian Canadian society" (TRC, "Summary" v). The IRS waged a genocidal attack on the bodies of Indigenous children, communities, and culture from the nineteenth century until 1996 when the last IRS, Gordon Indian Residential School in Saskatchewan, was closed. Although now closed, the schools continue their assault against Indigenous peoples through the sustained post-traumatic stress of survivors and their families, the racist attitudes that continue to fester in the hearts of many Canadians, and the many federal policies (old and new)[37] that egregiously ignore the needs of Indigenous peoples and communities.

---

[37] One such example of federal policies and practices that ignore the needs of Indigenous peoples can be found in Canadian prisons. There are a disproportionate number of Indigenous people incarcerated in the Canadian prison system: Indigenous men and women make up 24.6 percent of the total federal prison population, while Indigenous peoples make up only four percent of the total Canadian population (Chartrand). Convincing arguments have been made that the Canadian prison industrial complex is an extension of IRS for Indigenous peoples (MacDonald 2016; Finaly 2016; Chartrand 2018). Carol Finaly asserts that Canadian prisons are a "continuation of the harm done to indigenous peoples through the residential schools." Vicki Chartrand notes that Indigenous people are *more often* criminalized for acts linked to poverty, lack of education, lack of employment opportunities, substance abuse, mental health, sexual abuse, violence, and trauma, or "in other words, colonialism." Chartrand further argues that "prison environments often reflect and even perpetuate the very trauma and violence experienced by Indigenous peoples" in IRS.

In 2001, the Federal Office of Indian Residential Schools Resolution Canada was created to resolve the large numbers of abuse claims filed by IRS survivors against the federal government. On 23 November 2005, the federal government announced the "Indian Residential Schools Settlement Agreement," a two-billion-dollar compensation package for IRS survivors, for which, at the time, 86,000 people were eligible. The settlement was broken into five major components,[38] one of which was a 60 million-dollar allocation towards a Truth and Reconciliation Fund that aimed to "research, document, and preserve the experiences of the survivors and their families for future generations" (Residential School Class Action Litigation, 5). In the summer of 2015, the Truth and Reconciliation Commission (hereafter referred to as TRC) released its final reports that "document the truth of survivors, families, communities and anyone personally affected by the IRS experience" (TRC, "FAQ"). The TRC also established ninety-four calls to action intended to "redress the legacy of residential schools and advance the process of Canadian reconciliation" (TRC, "Calls to Action" 1).

The ignorance and dismissal of many Canadians about IRS and their traumatic legacies is emphasized in the TRC reports as a foundational obstacle to achieving reconciliation.[39] Many of

---

[38] These components include the Common Experience Payment (CEP) Fund, which allocated 1.9 billion dollars to IRS survivors; the Independent Assessment Process (IAP) which allocated additional funds to survivors who suffered "sexual or serious physical abuses, or other abuses that caused serious psychological effects" (Residential School Class Action Litigation 4); a Healing Fund granted to the Aboriginal Healing Foundation intended to fund "healing programs" (Residential School Class Action Litigation 5) for survivors and their families; and the commemoration fund for "national and community commemorative projects" (Residential School Class Action Litigation 5)

[39] I, and the TRC, use the term "reconciliation" with much hesitation, finding the terminology inadequate and fundamentally flawed. Believing that settler and First Nations' cultures can be reconciled assumes that "at some earlier time, [they] have been conciled; that is, two distinct parties, independent and moving in their own directions for their own reasons, meet, share, and decide to make their independent ways forward" (Chrisjohn and Wasacase 221). The notion of reconciliation adds to the master settler myth that Indigenous peoples and settlers at one time had a "single, shared and combined effort" (Chrisjohn and Wasacase 221) and "lived in peace and

the TRC's calls to action involve formal education reforms that would dispel and correct ignorance that permeates the history of IRS. In the "Education for Reconciliation" section within the "Calls to Action," the commission calls for "*age-appropriate* curriculum on residential schools, Treaties, and Aboriginal peoples' historical and contemporary contributions to Canada [to be made] a mandatory education requirement for Kindergarten to Grade Twelve students" ("Calls to Action" 61. i, emphasis added). In order to meet this call to action, picturebooks about Canadian IRS are gaining traction in elementary school curricula as tools for reconciliation.[40] However, representing trauma in an "age-appropriate" way often simplifies the traumas of Indigenous children who were taken so as not to "trouble" the implied child reader. In doing so, the well-being of the implied reader is put above that of the Indigenous children who were

---

harmony . . . only to have residential schooling . . . drive a wedge between Canadian and Indigenous peoples" (Chrisjohn and Wasacase 222). The TRC acknowledges that a conciliatory state has never existed between Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples, but explains it uses the term "reconciliation" to mean "establishing and maintaining a mutually respectful relationship between Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal peoples in this country" (TRC, "Summary" 6). As "reconciliation" is the term commonly used by the TRC and both Indigenous and settler scholars, I will stay consistent with current terminology despite my hesitation.

[40] I am uncomfortable with the term "age-appropriate" being used in reference to representations of trauma and atrocity. I do not believe it possible or ethical for trauma and atrocity ever to be made "appropriate," for they are in their very nature, and at the very least, inappropriate. I believe our attention should be on whether representations of trauma are respectful of trauma and to the survivors of it. However, this question of how to make trauma "age-appropriate" has dominated many conversations in regard to the intersections of trauma and children's literature, and I feel obligated to use the same terminology. Key scholarship that probes the intersections of trauma and children's literature includes Adrienne Kertzer's article "The Anxiety of Trauma in Children's War Fiction" (2008), and her book *My Mother's Voice: Children, Literature, and the Holocaust* (2002) in which Kertzer sees much of children's literature striving to protect young readers from the effects of trauma rather than exposing them to harsh realities; Eric Tribunella's *Melancholia and Maturation* (2010), where he argues trauma is deliberately included in children's literature as a form of discipline to mature child-readers into a certain kind of (wounded) adult; Kenneth Kidd's article "T is for Trauma" (2011), which claims that "children's literature is the most rather than the least appropriate forum for trauma work" (181), but that children's literature turns away, rather than confronts, the difficulties of trauma, often opting for "simplistic narratives of character empowerment" (185).

subjected to physical, emotional, sexual, and psychological abuses. Picturebooks about Canadian IRS challenge settler narratives about IRS but sanitize the traumatic experience of their protagonists.

This chapter examines a group of picturebooks about Canadian IRS that disrupts and extends the school story subgenre, begins the important work of restorying the nation, politicizes implied readers in the project of reconciliation, but ultimately simplifies the trauma of the IRS which limits the full extent to which the nation is restoried and readers politicized in the project of reconciliation. I examine the picturebooks *When I Was Eight* (2013) and *Not My Girl* (2014) that are both written by Inuvialuit writer Margaret Pokiak-Fenton and her Canadian settler daughter-in-law Christy Jordan-Fenton and illustrated by Québécois illustrator Gabrielle Grimard; *Shi-shi-etko* (2005) and *Shin-chi's Canoe* (2008) that are both written by Métis and Interior Salish author Nicola Campbell and illustrated by Canadian settler illustrator Kim LaFave; and *When We Were Alone* (2016) written by Swampy Cree author David A. Robertson and illustrated by Cree-Métis illustrator Julia Flett. Using Gerald Vizenor's concept of "survivance" and Dominic LaCapra's notion of "empathic unsettlement," I argue these picturebooks can unsettle Indigenous and non-Indigenous readers and implicate them in the process of reconciliation. Much like the characters and authors examined in Chapter Two, protagonists in these IRS school stories use everyday tactics to resist, subvert, and in all cases triumph over the oppressive IRS disciplinary structures and school administrators. The characters' "survivance" (a combination of survival and resistance), which are enacted through tactics that subvert and resist the disciplinary school structures, foster readings that begin to

unsettle "truths" long touted by master settler narratives.[41] However, the picturebooks function as Kenneth Kidd argues much of children's literature does: namely, the picturebooks "tur[n] away from rather than confront" trauma because of the "ongoing conviction" that children's literature "should be happy and uplifting, or at least not *too* disturbing" ("Trauma" 185, 183, emphasis original). In maintaining "happy" endings and focusing on their characters' empowerment, the full atrocities of the IRS remain obscure, and the full potential for the picturebooks to unsettle the master settler narratives remains untapped.

The School Story and Implied Readers

IRS school stories participate in many of the British nineteenth and early-twentieth century public-school story conventions such as early childhood sections, the long journey to school, the strangeness of the school space to new students, vivid descriptions of the school buildings and interior space, accounts of disciplinary structures, and visits home to contrast the changes in characters that the school has wrought. Similar to their school story predecessors, IRS school story picturebooks are themselves a school with a didactic intention to "illuminate" a "dark" period in Canada's history. The IRS picturebooks I examine endorse surface ideologies that run counter to those that governed the IRS and that continue to inform many federal policies and some settlers' attitudes towards Indigenous peoples. Rather than the ethos of the school space being transmitted to readers in the hope it will stimulate a similar moral education to that which the characters experience (as was the case in public-school stories), the authors and illustrators

[41] The "master narrative" is the body of stories that "embody the settlers' socially shared understanding" (Episkenew 2). The master narrative is a "myth of the new Canadian nation-state, which valorizes the settlers but which sometimes misrepresents and more often excludes Indigenous peoples" (Episkenew 2).

depict IRS to challenge and destroy the values and ideologies of the school space from persisting in our present and future.

Some of the authors, illustrators, and publishers' distance from the experience and legacy of IRS, and their distance from Indigenous communities more generally, troubles the extent to which these picturebooks can accurately represent the experiences of Indigenous children who attended IRS. In the previous chapter I argue that Arnold Lunn, Alec Waugh, Martin Browne, and Jack Hood appropriate the public-school space and schoolboy experience by positioning themselves as authorities of the space due to their positionality as (recent) students. The picturebooks in this chapter also appropriate a school space (the IRS) by positioning their Indigenous student protagonists as the authorities of the school experience instead of the settler school administrators, Canadian federal government, and others who have constructed and perpetuated the master narratives of the schools. The IRS picturebooks add a layer of complexity in how they claim authority, or redirect the narrative perspective, over the school space in that not every author or illustrator has a firsthand experience of IRS (Margaret Pokiak-Fenton is the only author in the group to attend an IRS), or do not come from an Indigenous community. The authors in Chapter Two argued that their accounts were the first authentic and realist depictions of public-school life because of their current or recent immersion in the space. None of the authors, illustrators, or publishers of the picturebooks in this chapter claim to provide the first authentic depiction of IRS, but they participate in a larger movement that seeks to combat the ignorance surrounding IRS by producing more "truthful" accounts than had previously circulated. Each publisher, for example, in their descriptions of the picturebooks on their websites clearly connects their fictional narratives to the actual practices of IRS in Canada: Annick Press indicates that *When I Was Eight* is based on a true story ("When I Was Eight");

Groundwood Press describes the protagonist in *Shi-shi-etko* as "on the verge of a great loss—a loss that native people have endured for generations *because of the residential schools system*" ("Shi-shi-etko," emphasis added); and Highwater Press describes *When We Were Alone* as a story "about a difficult time in history" ("When We Were Alone").

The picturebooks depart dramatically from the public-school story originators of the school story subgenre in their challenge of colonial and imperialist pedagogies. Unlike the youth authors and characters in my previous chapter, the subversive nature of the IRS picturebooks is not directly related to the immediacy of their (authors, illustrators, publishers') connection to the schools, but more broadly in their narratives' directing focus to the perspective of Indigenous students. The picturebooks validate the Indigenous cultures that the IRS school structures – and the colonial agenda of the Canadian federal government– sought to destroy.

The implied readers of these picturebooks include non-Indigenous (Canadian settlers and recent immigrants) and Indigenous readers (those with and without direct familial ties to IRS) who bring a diversity of experiences and positionalities to their reading experiences. Jo-Ann Episkenew, a Métis scholar, argues that "Indigenous writers are cognizant of their diverse audience," and thus embed "*a multiplicity of implied readers* within the text of their narratives, so that each category of implied reader will understand the narrative somewhat differently, depending on their societal positionality" (13, emphasis added). The Indigenous and allied writers and illustrators of the IRS picturebooks are likewise able to address a multiplicity of implied readers, and the methods by which they do so will be discussed in greater detail throughout the chapter.

The picturebooks function on multiple levels of address and will elicit varied responses that are rooted in a reader's prior knowledge and positionality. Episkenew argues that Indigenous

narratives "implicate settler readers by exposing the structures that sustain White privilege and by compelling them to examine their position of privilege and their complicity in the continued oppression of Indigenous people" (17). Non-Indigenous readers may be unsettled by reading IRS picturebooks in the knowledge that their ability to live where and as they do within Canada has been made possible because of the objectification of Indigenous peoples and the genocides of the IRS. If the TRC's educational calls to action are met, a "multiplicity" of non-Indigenous students will be further exposed to the history of IRS and Indigenous literatures. Métis scholar Aubrey Jean Hanson, in her discussion regarding how to incorporate Indigenous literatures into Canadian classrooms in a post-TRC society, justifies her *own* focus on implied non-Indigenous readers with the explanation that Canadian classrooms often "include a large proportion of non-Indigenous students, a non-Indigenous instructor, and an epistemological framework largely rooted in Eurocentric traditions," and thus it is "fair to suggest that Indigenous literatures often enter largely non-Indigenous spaces" (76). Following Hanson's lead, and the high probability that many Canadian institutional school spaces are peopled with non-Indigenous readers/students, my analysis is at times directed more towards a non-Indigenous implied reader rather than Indigenous. [42]

Implied Indigenous readers also occupy a diversity of positions: Indigenous Nations carry with them different histories, values, and practices that will affect what knowledge readers bring

[42] I feel compelled to acknowledge my own discursive subjectivity in this analysis. My grandparents immigrated to Canada from Ireland and Sweden in the 1930s, and I was born on, grew up on, and continue to live on Treaty Seven land. My family and personal history situate me as a settler on Turtle Island and a cultural outsider to the picture books I consider in this chapter. However, the history and legacy of IRS are not (nor should they be) designated solely for Indigenous peoples; they are a part of Canadian history. As a settler who lives on Treaty land, my history as a Canadian includes the IRS, and the TRC argues that "all Canadians have a critical role to play in advancing reconciliation in ways that honour and revitalize the nation-to-nation Treaty relationship" (TRC "Summary," 183).

with them to the picturebooks; varied levels of knowledge or ignorance regarding IRS in Canada impacts how Indigenous readers approach the picturebooks just as non-Indigenous readers; and readers could be the children and/or grandchildren of IRS survivors, which positions their familial history as directly linked to the subject matter of the picturebooks. From their reading, Indigenous readers may be unsettled from internalized prejudice and racism in the knowledge of the genocide committed against themselves and their communities, and they may feel empowered in witnessing the protagonists' resilience. In her study of Indigenous readers' responses to Sherman Alexie's *The Absolutely True Diary of a Part-Time Indian* (2007), allied scholar Erin Spring found that her participants made "texts personal by infiltrating them with versions of their world" (59), and the exposure to texts that were culturally relevant empowered participants "to contribute to society in meaningful ways. This is turn promotes resilience and reduces vulnerability" (59). The same could be possible for Indigenous readers of IRS picturebooks, and the act of unsettlement from the master settler narrative could be one of empowerment.

The "Age-Appropriate" Debate, Survivance, and Unsettling Narratives

Debates Surrounding the "Age-Appropriate" Question

The TRC released its reports in June of 2015, and by September of the same year some educators began to answer the TRC's educational calls by including picturebooks about IRS in curricula for kindergarten and elementary-aged children. Others went beyond the call, such as a Vancouver day-care teacher who read Pokiak-Fenton, Jordan-Fenton, and Grimard's *When I Was Eight* to her three- and four-year-old students. The action led to controversy as some parents worried the subject matter was not appropriate for children so young, but the teacher, Kristen

Webster, insisted the picturebook made the history age-appropriate and that "[y]ou're never too young or too old to learn" (McCue). Webster is a former student of Anishinaabe professor Jan Hare, who teaches a course at the University of British Columbia on the integration of Indigenous perspectives into classrooms. Hare defended her former student's choice and emphasized that if others do the same it should be likewise age-appropriate: "You may not be teaching the very horrific dimensions of this history," yet "[w]e need to give them a language to talk about it in a way that we don't *frighten them* or *trouble some of their emotions*" (Hare qtd. in McCue, emphasis added). Webster argues that reading these picturebooks to young children is important because "children need to know their country, where they are, and the people who live in it. It's about building community and empathy" (Webster qtd. in McCue).

These school stories are significant and revolutionary in their depiction of Canadian IRS; however, their situation within the intersections of trauma and childhood make them highly contested sites. There are differing views on the ethical ramifications of representing, or not representing, the realities of trauma. This contestation is evident in the widely polarizing critical reviews of each picturebook examined in this chapter. For example, Samantha Cutrara performed a literature review that includes the picturebooks discussed in this chapter with the exception of *When We Were Alone*. While Cutrara finds all the stories "unique and interesting," she is troubled that "the experience of the residential schools feels very narrow and distant" in lacking details of the abuses against students as well as missing "a sense of responsibility and accountability by or for the Government of Canada" (Cutrara). Conversely, Chantelle Bellrichard includes the same group of picturebooks as Cutrara in a list of books about IRS to read with children, and she praises the group for being "mindful of what's appropriate, emotionally and developmentally" (Bellrichard). These two divergent reviews represent the conflicting beliefs

regarding how to make the genocide of IRS age-appropriate, what constitutes age-appropriateness, and whether it is ethical for historical trauma to be made "appropriate."

Many of the authors and illustrators examined in this chapter have publicly expressed their desire to make the history of IRS age-appropriate for young readers as the incentive for their stories. David A. Robertson was inspired by the TRC's call for the inclusion of IRS in kindergarten curricula to write *When We Were Alone*. Robertson had previously written novels and graphic novels aimed at YA audiences on the topic of IRS, and he describes broaching the subject for younger readers as being a "delicate subject," in that "[w]e can't introduce it fully at that age, it's not appropriate," but that if "we can teach something very basic about it, to give them an introduction to it that *doesn't bring up a lot of difficulties* that our kids experienced in those schools, then I think it becomes appropriate. It becomes necessary" (Robertson qtd. in Caruk, emphasis added).

Julie Flett, the illustrator of *When We Were Alone,* also speaks of her initial hesitation to work on the project because of the implied young readership, and she reminisces about asking Robertson, "how were we going to read the story to children if we can't read it without crying?" (Flett). Flett's comment is indicative of the belief that literature for young children should be happy and uplifting, and she operates under the assumption that children do not have the capabilities to process an adult's genuine emotional reaction to atrocity and trauma—for why else would it be a problem that the author and illustrator be moved to tears in front of their implied youth audiences? Flett speaks specifically to the difficulty of depicting the protagonist's haircut at school: "I found myself having to work and rework this image so that it was *sensitive* enough for children. . . . I tried to draw it in a *truthful* way but in a *sensitive* way" (Flett, emphasis added). While Robertson does not expound on why the history cannot be fully

introduced to kindergarten-aged children, nor does Flett expound on her connection between truth, sensitivity, and her implied young readers, the belief is most directly expressed in Hare's earlier statement that one does not want to "frighten" or "trouble the emotions" of young readers, and this uncovers the assumption that exposing young children to representations of trauma will in turn traumatize, or at the very least trouble, readers. This not only privileges the experience of implied young readers over the experiences of Indigenous children who attended IRS, but operates under the assumption that children are not capable of processing transparent representations of trauma. This functions in direct contrast to John Cech's assertion that picturebooks *must* engage with the realities of the world without being condescending to young readers because "[i]f we cannot protect our children from a violent world, perhaps we can at least equip them with the political insight and the moral courage to recognize and to act to change some of these conditions" (206).

Some find the simplified and "sensitive" depictions of IRS do not do enough to demystify the ignorance of many Canadians, and as continuing to shield Canadians from fully comprehending the "difficult truth" of IRS. Debbie Reese, who runs the *American Indians in Children's Literature* website, argues that "we need stories that do justice to the experiences of the children who were in those schools," and stories that are handled with "care and respect" ("Stolen Words"). Reese, who wrote a positive review of Robertson and Flett's *When We Were Alone*, finds offensive, conversely, Melanie Florence (indicated as of Cree/Scottish heritage in her author biography) and Grimard's attempt in the picturebook *Stolen Words* (2017) to make the history of IRS age-appropriate by adding fairy tale elements. Reese contends that "the words and the art exploit readers and turn something that was very painful and genocidal into a fairy tale"

and that does not handle the "brutal realities of the schools" ("Stolen Words").[43] For Reese, being age-appropriate does not mean sheltering readers from the trauma students of the IRS experienced, and she questions the ethics of softening "truths" with fantastical elements.

There is no simple answer to the debate of whether making representations of trauma age-appropriate is itself appropriate, how to best ethically represent historical trauma, and it is not the intention of this chapter to prescribe a method of doing so. However, I argue that the potential of the picturebooks to redress the ignorance and dismissal of IRS is limited in their turning away from trauma for "simplistic narratives of character empowerment" (Kidd, "Trauma" 185). The authors' and illustrators' argue they make their narratives "age-appropriate" by focusing on characters who are triumphant in challenging and resisting the colonial school space, which enables the narratives to include happy and uplifting endings. Robertson argues it is important "to show the pride that exists among Indigenous people in their culture" and to base his story "around a woman who went to residential school but never lost her identity" (Robertson qtd. in Caruk). During their address at the International Research Society for Children's Literature Congress in 2017, Jordan-Fenton stated that she wanted to represent a character who triumphed in an IRS and to show the character based on Pokiak-Fenton as the hero that she is ("Indigeneity"). In these, and the other examples to be examined in this chapter, the authors and

---

[43] Reese also considers Florence's connection to Indigenous communities tenuous. Florence writes she is of Cree/Scottish heritage, and that she "never had the chance to talk with her grandfather about his Cree heritage," (*Stolen Words*), or "[i]n other words, she didn't grow up as a Cree person" (Reese, "Stolen Words"). Reese argues that "[w]ithout a tangible connection to Cree people, the risk that we have a story that is more like something a Scottish person would write, is very high" ("Stolen Words"). Interestingly, Reese does not mention Grimard at all in the review (she does not even list Grimard as the illustrator), and thus does not have the same concern that the illustrator also does not demonstrate a "tangible connection to Cree people." Reese's comments (and silence on Grimard) are significant because they gesture towards larger and ongoing debates on who should tell stories about IRS, and (in the case of picturebooks) why authors are often held to a higher standard than illustrators in regard to who is "telling" the story.

illustrators frame their picturebooks as age-appropriate because of their characters' successes in resisting the pedagogies of assimilation at their schools. The characters triumphs *are* significant in that they begin to restory the treatment of Indigenous children at the schools, but the texts do not fully confront the atrocities committed at the schools which continues to leave implied young readers with half-truths and ultimately undercuts the triumphs of these protagonists.

Triumph in Survivance

The IRS picturebooks focus on their characters' triumphs over the school space, which positions the stories as political narratives of Indigenous survivance. Daniel Heath Justice (of the Cherokee Nation) argues it would be a mistake to see the lives of Indigenous peoples as primarily shaped by colonization ("Go Away" 152). Kristina Fagan (member of NunatuKavut) engages Justice's argument and pushes it even further when she suggests that in focusing "too much on colonization, we risk ignoring the ways in which Indigenous people have gone on, even in the face of great challenges" ("Response"). Anishinaabe scholar, Gerald Vizenor, developed the notion of "survivance" to describe the ways in which Indigenous narratives combine survival and resistance to challenge the domination and victimization of Indigenous peoples. Vizenor argues that survivance "creates a sense of narrative resistance to absence, literary tragedy, nihility, and victimry" (1), and that survivance narratives are a "renunciation" of "dominance, detractions, obtrusions, the unbearable sentiments of tragedy, and the legacy of victimry" contained in historical settler narratives (86). Survivance is an "active resistance" to colonization and to master settler narratives (Vizenor 88). Similarly, Fagan evokes the concept of survivance in her call for narratives that focus on "what has not been taken away from Indigenous peoples," but on how "collectively, as Indigenous peoples, we have also gone on. . . .We, and our spirits, have

carried on" ("Response"). The picturebooks' visual narratives begin to meet Fagan's call through their depiction of characters who are triumphant (in varying degrees) to holding onto their spirits and cultures through acts of survivance that defy the master settler narrative. Yet, the picturebooks considered in this chapter uniformly situate the trauma of the schools being in that they separated children from their families and culture, and they do not represent the numerous accounts the TRC detailed of physical, psychological, and sexual abuses. The survivance of the picturebook characters would be even more powerful if readers were given a more complete representation of the insidious acts of violence that many Indigenous children experienced during their time as IRS students.

Though the representation of the "great challenges" (Fegan, "Response") Indigenous children faced at IRS is limited, the authors and illustrators' decisions to focus on the survivance of Indigenous children is a highly political choice that deconstructs and challenges the IRS and the settler myths that have proliferated about them. This is comparable to the authors examined Chapter Two: they deconstructed the representations of public-schools that had been proliferated by public-school stories, and they challenged these representations with their own depictions, which, they argued, were more authentic. Allied scholar Sam McKegney argues that Indigenous-written IRS narratives "offer profound complications to the historical record as it stands, commenting not only on how residential schooling is remembered but also on how its legacy ought to be reacted to, its transgressions addressed, and its survivors (and their communities) empowered" (17). The same can be said of the group of picturebooks in this chapter, for the focus on characters' survivance counters the pedagogy of the actual schools that intended to assimilate and eradicate Indigenous cultures, though accounts that more directly confront the trauma of the schools would offer even more profound complications to the "historical record."

Unsettling the Master Narrative

The surface ideologies of the survivance IRS picturebooks "restory" settler narratives of IRS and encourage reading practices in which young readers (Indigenous and non-Indigenous alike) are "unsettled" from the settler narratives that have proliferated about IRS. In positing how to live up to touted Canadian social ideals and not repeat past atrocities, scholars emphasize the imperative role of education in the journey towards reconciliation (Harrison 153; Saul 319; Wolf and DePasquale 88; Regan 11). To meet the TRC's calls to action must involve replacing curricula that contain false settler narratives regarding the IRS with accounts focused on Indigenous children's experiences of the schools. This shift in curricula would disconnect young students from damaging settler narratives that breed prejudice and racism (and halt reconciliation) before they have taken root, or settled in.

A valuable form of education towards reconciliation is achieved by listening to and reading Indigenous narratives. How implied young readers (in this case, specifically non-Indigenous) respond to Indigenous narratives is paramount in determining whether past behaviours will be sustained and continued into the future with younger generations: as one unnamed IRS survivor expressed, "By listening to your story, my story can change. By listening to your story, I can change" (TRC "Summary," 21). Education towards reconciliation cannot be simply "the transfer of knowledge" (Regan 23) but must link critical thinking to action. Further, no action, or "durable ethical and political change," can occur without the "re-education of affect in its relation to normative judgement" (LaCapra, *Writing* 137). Racist and prejudiced attitudes of Canadian settler culture towards Indigenous peoples that have been fostered by many Canadian federal polices, and that are supported by circulating biased and false master

narratives, must be challenged and changed for authentic political and social change to take place in the present and future and for reconciliatory attitudes to be bred in young people.

In his *Writing History, Writing Trauma* (2001), Dominick LaCapra argues that "[b]eing responsive to the traumatic experience of others . . . implies not the appropriation of their experience but . . . empathic unsettlement [that] poses a barrier to closure in discourse" (*Writing* 41-2). In *History in Transit* (2004), LaCapra links what he calls "affective involvement," which is a "response to the other [that] comes with respect for the otherness of the other, which is obliterated in identification" (135), as a form of "empathic unsettlement," and he regards affective involvement as imperative to the experience of empathic unsettlement. Empathic unsettlement engages in a "virtual experience through which one puts oneself in the other's position while recognizing the difference of that position and hence not taking the other's place" (LaCapra, *History* 78). This is similar to Sara Ahmed's assertion that when witnessing another's pain "[o]ur task is to learn to hear what is impossible. And this is only possible if *we respond to pain that we cannot claim* as our own" (*Cultural Politics* 35, emphasis added).

Paulette Regan finds LaCapra's notion of "empathic unsettlement" useful in navigating the complicated responses of non-Indigenous readers to hearing Indigenous testimonies and narratives about IRS. Regan advocates for truth and reconciliation movements that avoid "appropriating survivors' pain in voyeuristic ways that enable non-Indigenous people to feel good about feeling bad" (47). She also calls for non-Indigenous readers to be unsettled empathetically through critical education and to "assume responsibility for *challenging their own world views*, engaging in truth telling about the past, and taking action to address historical wrong-doings" (48, emphasis added). I further contend that survivance narratives can empathetically unsettle young readers and unmoor them from master settler narratives, and this

in-turn implicates young readers in the project of reconciliation by adopting more compassionate attitudes and behaviours between settler and Indigenous peoples.

The Resistance of Olemaun

When I Was Eight and *Not My Girl* begin to restory the master settler narratives of IRS, and depict a protagonist who triumphs in her school space, but the picturebooks contain the trauma to the protagonist's being removed from her family which limits her survivance and the extent to which the narratives complicate the historical record. *When I Was Eight* is a first-person narrative based on Pokiak-Fenton's own experience at an IRS. The text follows Olemaun from her home on Banks Island to an IRS in Aklavik.[44] Olemaun's older sister, Rosie, already attends the Aklavik IRS and during a visit home brings with her a copy of Lewis Carroll's *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland* (1865). Olemaun is curious about the girl named Alice and becomes determined to attend Rosie's school in order to learn to read this outsiders' book herself. Her father does not want Olemaun to go to Rosie's school because he "knew things about the school that I [Olemaun] did not" (*Eight*). After relentlessly begging her father to take her to the school, she is "reluctantly" allowed to attend, but the IRS does not live up to any of Olemaun's expectations (*Eight*). Olemaun teaches herself to read English—and Carroll's fantasy tale—in spite of the school's oppressive and degrading environment, which is organized to provide an education in manual labour rather than in academic subjects.

[44] The picture book is an adaption of Jordan-Fenton and Pokiak-Fenton's young adult novel *Fatty Legs* (2010). While not within the scope of this paper, the choices the authors make in regard to what is excluded from the YA novel in the picturebook adaptation (such as the details of physical abuse) further indicates what is thought to be age-appropriate.

Olemaun's survivance is further depicted in *Not My Girl* (2014), which tells of Olemaun's return home after two years at school and examines the effects of the IRS pedagogy.[45] Forbidden to speak her mother language at school, Olemaun struggles to reconnect with her mother because of the school-created language barrier. Olemaun feels out of place in having forgotten how to "set traps, skin hares, or pluck geese" and is frustrated that learning how to "recite verse and make my bed" does not help her to "feed the family" (*Girl*). Yet Olemaun is able to relearn the skill she has forgotten with the help of her family, and her re-education is a resistance to the oppression of her IRS.

When I Was Eight opens with a glimpse into eight-year-old Olemaun's life on Banks Island prior to leaving for school. It is common in children's literature narratives about IRS to open with the child character at home. [46] The childhood and home sections in school stories generally narrate characters' early education to provide contrast between home and school life, and to exhibit the growth of the students over the course of their school experiences. In IRS school stories, this contrast between home and school life demonstrates what is lost and/or threatened by the institutional school experience and establishes characters' deep connections to their culture and families. Doris Wolf and Paul DePasquale found in their study of Indigenous-authored picturebooks prior to 2008 that "no matter the age, location, or specific circumstances of the Aboriginal child protagonist, the child's interactions with both family and setting generally

---

[45] The picture book is an adaptation of Jordan-Fenton and Pokiak-Fenton's young adult novel *A Stranger at Home* (2011).

[46] Significant deviations to this trend include the children's novels *My Name is Seepeetza* (1998) by Shirley Stirling and *These Are My Words: The Residential School Diary of Violet Pesheens* (2016) written by Ruby Slipperjack of the Eabametoong First Nation. Both novels are written in diary format and begin once protagonists have arrived at school. Home and family are depicted through Seepeetza's and Violet's memories, displaying what William Bevis terms "homing in," in which protagonists maintain a strong sense of belonging to their culture through invoking memories of home (581).

are offered as idyllic" (91).[47] *When I Was Eight* does not deviate from this trend as Olemaun's relationships with her family are warm and compassionate, especially when compared to the cold, distant, and antagonistic connections she has with the settler adults at her school.

The blatant contrast between home and school is emphasized visually by Grimard's representations of the school space by means of muted dark colours and bare backgrounds. In comparison, Grimard's illustrations of Banks Island have more detailed backgrounds and foregrounds, feature outdoor scenes, and are filled with colour. The illustrations of Banks Island, for example, highlight the "landscape and [Olemaun's] connection with nature . . . [that] constructs the text itself as an antidote to the sterility of residential school isolation and enforced familial disconnection" (McKegeny 14). In comparison to the sequel, *Not My Girl*, which takes place completely on Banks Island, *When I Was Eight* has noticeably bare backgrounds in the sequences that depict Olemaun's life at school, which in turn constructs the school space as an all-encompassing space of absence created by trauma. While at school, Olemaun is often depicted against stark white backgrounds with no horizon lines, or she is situated in dark and empty rooms that are devoid of warmth. In contrast to the colour-filled pages of Banks Island at the beginning of *When I Was Eight*, the school illustrations stress the school's bareness, sterility, desolation, and isolation.

---

[47] This same trend generally does not apply to children's and young adult novels about IRS. Some ambiguously incorporate depictions of homes that are not safe spaces for Indigenous children. In Ruby Slipperjack's *These Are My Words*, some students are relieved not to be sent home at Christmas holiday because "[p]eople kill each other at Christmas where I come from. We are always so scared" (100). In Slipperjack's novel, Violet is the second generation of her family to be sent to IRS, like many of her peers, and the trauma of the IRS experience has continued its torment in the lives of Violet and her peers' parents. The school is not presented as a safe alternative for these students but offers its own dangers to students including sexual and physical abuse. It is made clear that the school's disciplinary practices and abuses committed by school administrators have greatly contributed to the dangerous home environments.

The authors and illustrator both disrupt the notion that the schools provided a needed and valuable education by portraying Olemaun as a knowledgeable child before attending school, in that she "knew many things when [she] was eight" (*Eight*). Olemaun has already received a valuable education and important skills that contribute to her family's daily life; this dispels the myth of the "ignorant" Indigenous child as a *tabula rasa* needing, and standing ready, to be filled with Western knowledge. For example, Olemaun knows how to "keep the sled dogs quiet while Father snuck up on caribou, and bring the team to him after a kill," a skill that in turn enables her to help provide her family with food (*Eight*). She also understands that "the sun slept in the winter and woke in the summer. And I knew that when the sun-warmed Arctic Ocean shrugged off its slumbering ice, we would cross it to trade furs with the outsiders" (*Eight*). This knowledge indicates Olemaun is learning lessons essential for the continuation of her family's life in the future. The illustrations that accompany the text show Olemaun caring for a puppy, and this image signifies that Olemaun is considered responsible and capable by her family, as the puppy is a valuable future resource upon which the family will depend. Thus, the "many things" Olemaun knows position her as a useful, contributing, and valuable member of her family, whereas the pedagogical process of the IRS seeks to replace this important knowledge with skills that are useless and unrelated to her Inuvialuit family's daily life.

The authors and illustrator challenge the pragmatism of the IRS education further by exposing the emphasis on manual labour, rather than academics, that hinders Olemaun's progress of learning to read English. Olemaun wants to read *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland* herself, and it is her wish to learn to read English that induces her to beg her father, "like a hungry dog after scraps," to be sent to the outsiders' school (*Eight*). The authors' choice of inspiration is ripe with significance: Alice's adventures into the strange and upside-down world of Wonderland

mirror Olemaun's own entry into the darkly nonsensical world of the IRS. However, it takes Olemaun longer than she expects to read about Alice's adventures herself. Once at school, Olemaun spends most of her time performing manual labour: "Instead of sitting in desks, we scrubbed the floor beneath them" (*Eight*). Even though Olemaun "worked hard" it brings her "no closer to being able to read" (*Eight*). Rather than learning the Western "education" that is flaunted as the consolation prize for enduring the egregious abuses committed against Indigenous students (there are four images of Olemaun and her peers performing chores, and only one image of them sitting in desks), Jordan-Fenton, Pokiak-Fenton, and Grimard "re-story" the education that was provided by the school as an education that prepared students for subservient lives of domestic service and manual labour afterwards. Olemaun does learn to read the outsiders' books while at school, but does so despite, not because of, the school. Here, Olemaun rebels in a similar fashion to Alec Waugh's protagonist, Gordon, who criticizes the oppressive imperialistic education he receives at public school, and instead undertakes a self-directed study that stimulates his critical thinking. Olemaun and Gordon learn little from their schools' offered curricula, and they are instead autonomous in their self-directed critical education. Olemaun accomplishes her self-education by memorizing letters from chalkboards before cleaning them, she studies English words on bottles of cleaning supplies, and eventually she begins the ritual of covertly spelling out words to herself. Similar again to Gordon, any "useful" education (in this case learning to read English only because it is what Olemaun wants to accomplish) is achieved by Olemaun on her own, and this strips the school and its settler administrators of any share in her success.

The strenuous manual labour not only prepares students for subservient adult careers afterwards, but also acts as a disciplinary tactic to make the Indigenous students' bodies docile,

as Olemaun describes, “[M]y muscles ached from the hard work, and I could barely keep my eyes open” (*Eight*). The IRS teachers and administrators aspired to be fully self-sufficient from government funding (TRC “The History,” 79, 81, 694). In pursuit of this goal, students were responsible for the upkeep of the schools’ buildings and grounds to curtail expenses. Students were also used as the primary source of labour in growing produce that was sold for the profit of the school or that ended up on the dinner table of the teachers (TRC “The History,” 81). Students rarely, if ever, were allowed to enjoy the fruits of their own labour. In *When I Was Eight*, student bodies are exhausted by this work which in turn leaves them little energy for their studies. They are made obedient and submissive in their exhaustion. Olemaun and her peers wake “very early for chores. . . . We washed walls and dishes and laundry” (*Eight*). To accompany this text, Grimard devotes a full-page illustration of Olemaun on her knees with a hunched back scrubbing a floor, and in the background are two female peers in the same position with tired and downturned eyes. Grimard includes no horizon line which makes the floor cleaned by the girls appear endless.

Olemaun resists being made docile by this strenuous labour (“she [the nun] could not wear out my determination” [*Eight*]), and in one instance she is openly rebellious in her frustration with the educational aims of the school. One evening Olemaun rushes through dinner for extra reading time and is stopped by a nun, who in a “threatening tone” tells Olemaun, ‘“Not so fast, Margaret. There are pots to be scrubbed”’ (*Eight*). Grimard includes a small image of a tower of encrusted pots and pans. Unable to hold back her frustration Olemaun mutters, ‘“I could be reading”’ (*Eight*). Olemaun’s condemnation of this injustice is coupled with an illustration that depicts the nun looming over her. Olemaun does not cower but stands tall with her arms crossed in defiance, and her eyes confidently and directly meet the nun’s scowl. Grimard’s

illustration depicts Olemaun's refusal to become a docile body and physically signifies her survivance in how she holds and maintains control over her own body.

Olemaun mentally returns home, a process William Bevis calls "homing in" (581), by remembering home to strengthen her resolve when she is disciplined by the nuns. The nuns attempt to break Olemaun's confidence by locking her in the school cellar. The cellar is cloaked in student mythology ("I'd heard stories of children who disappeared down in that dark cavern" [*Eight*]) intended to effect fear and the students' submission. Olemaun again resists being made docile by fear by "homing in" on the spirit of her father, recalling memories of home, and spelling-out English words. The words Olemaun chooses to spell further evoke home and act as survivance: she spells her Inuvialuktun name (in the process, resisting her school-given name of Margaret), "Banks Island," and she begins to spell out "Alice" as a reminder of why she came to the school in the first place and what her goal is. The letters encircle Olemaun, and their chalk-like colour provides light in the dark space. In the same image, Grimard draws a chalk outline of Olemaun's father, who embraces his daughter. In this instance, Olemaun reappropriates a space of punishment into a space with which to empower herself, and the words she chooses act to "undermine the separation of home and school that forms the basis of the assimilation agency" (Eigenbrod 288). Olemaun overwrites the intended effects (shame and fear) of the space by injecting the space with thoughts of home and an affirmation of her goals, and she re-appropriates the school space to strengthen, rather than weaken, her connection to home.

The use of English, both the language in which *When I Was Eight* is written and the language Olemaun works tirelessly to learn, is also significant as both the child character's and adult authors' use and mastery of English function as an indicator of their survivance rather than a marker of their assimilation. Gloria Bird (member of the Spokane Tribe of Washington State)

and Joy Harjo (member of the Muscogee Nation) argue that when Indigenous authors manipulate English, not only the language but also its literary traditions, they create a "'new language' that is made 'usefully tough and beautiful'" (23-4). Bird and Harjo suggest that by reinventing the enemies' language it turns "images around to mirror an image of the colonized to the colonizers as a process of decolonization. . . . [I]t is at this site where 'reinventing' can occur to undo some of the damage that colonization has wrought" (22). *Alice,* from the British literary canon, is claimed as Olemaun's own as she uses the novel to make meaning of her own experience. Several times, Olemaun compares her IRS experience to Alice's in Wonderland. Olemaun "felt like Alice after a bit of magic cake" when she outsmarts a nun by burning Olemaun's hated pair of red stockings, and she compares the nun to the red "Queen" and her peers to "the Queen's henchmen" when they tear apart their dormitory to search for the burnt stockings (*Eight*). At the picturebook's conclusion, Olemaun demonstrates triumphantly in front of a stunned nun that she has taught herself to read:

> I was Olemaun, conqueror of evil, reader of books. I was a girl who traveled to a strange and faraway land to stand against a tyrant, like Alice. And like Alice, I was brave, clever, and as unyielding as the strong stone that sharpens an ulu. I finally knew this, like I knew many things, because now I could read. (*Girl*)

Olemaun manipulates a well-known colonial text to help "re-story" the settlers' master narrative with truths about the actual experiences of Indigenous children in IRS, and this opens up possibilities for readings that empathetically unsettle and implicate readers in the journey towards reconciliation.

Olemaun returns home in *Not My Girl,* and in her return, home functions as a restorative space that aids in Olemaun's survivance through her re-education. Olemaun is changed by her

time at school, and her family is grieved to witness such a change in their daughter. While the love for their daughter has not altered, Olemaun is frustrated that she cannot contribute to her family's daily life as she had at the beginning of *When I Was Eight,* and Olemaun struggles to determine how she now fits and relates to her family. However, knowledge lost is regained by working alongside her parents; Olemaun's relearns the "many things" that she knew when she was eight (*Eight*).

Olemaun's rediscovery of daily home skills is intertwined with the rediscovery of her cultural self. In one example, Olemaun's mother places "her ulu in my hands. She guided the knife up the fish's belly, *patiently* showing me how to do it" (*Girl*). The name "Olemaun" stands for the "stubborn stone that sharpens the half-moon ulu knife" (*Eight*); in other words, "olemaun" is the stone that sharpens the ulu. Rather than the stone sharpening the ulu, the ulu "sharpens" Olemaun in a reclamation of her cultural life; the use of the ulu reminds Olemaun of who she is, and she learns this while guided by her mother's hands. As well, physical proximity to her family is what allows Olemaun to regain the sled dogs' trust: they let her approach only once she shares her family's scent. In this case, Olemaun not only regains her past knowledge of how to handle the sled dogs, but she surpasses it. Olemaun demonstrates her expert driving and care of the dogs, and her father acknowledges this progress by gifting Olemaun her own dog sled. In both examples, being physically close/embraced by her family facilitates her re-education, providing a stark contrast to the cold and distant relationships she had with school administrators.

Readers' time with Olemaun ends with her mother "proudly" shouting '"My girl!"' (*Girl*). The shout is a declaration, an act of reclamation, that Olemaun has not been assimilated by the outsiders' education, but she continues to belong *to* her family. Olemaun and her family

have triumphed over the IRS, yet the books do not fully confront the atrocities of the school, which undercuts the triumph of Olemaun's survivance. Thus, the picturebooks begin the work of restorying the master settler narratives regarding the IRS, but there is much left obscured in Olemaun's experience having been "softened" for a younger audience.

Shi-shi-etko and Shin-chi Looked at Everything

Shi-shi-etko (2005) and *Shin-chi's Canoe* (2008), like the Fentons' and Grimard's picturebooks, focus on the forced separation of Indigenous children from their families and situate the difficulty of IRS in loneliness, which greatly simplifies the trauma of the schools. The protagonists, like Olemaun, resist the forced separation and loneliness but their survivance would be more fully depicted if the trauma of the IRS was directly confronted. *Shi-shi-etko* and *Shin-chi's Canoe* are both written by Nicola E. Campbell and illustrated by Kim LaFave. *Shi-shi-etko* follows the four days prior to Shi-shi-etko's departure for IRS. Each day is spent with a different family member (mother, father, Yayah/grandmother) who encourages Shi-shi-etko to remember specific aspects of her home life. Her mother tells Shi-shi-etko "to remember the ways of our people . . . our songs and our dances, our laughter and our joy" (*Shi-shi-etko*); the father encourages his daughter to remember "the trees, mountains, and water around them" (*Shi-shi-etko*); and Yayah gifts Shi-shi-etko a small bag made of deer hide to store her memories in, and urges her granddaughter, "No matter where you go, no matter what you do, remember to keep them [the memories] safe" (*Shi-shi-etko*). After each request, the text states that "Shi-shi-etko could not help herself. She looked at everything" (*Shi-shi-etko*). Shi-shi-etko internalizes her family's call to remember her home life and is resistant to the assimilation agenda of the IRS before entering the school space by making a resolution to remember her people, culture, and

ways of life. In *Shin-chi's Canoe,* Shi-shi-etko has returned home from her first year at school and prepares to return to school with her little brother, Shin-chi. In this sequel, readers are taken inside the IRS and shown what life is like for the siblings. The siblings keep their promises to remember through daily acts of subversion and rebellion that aid in maintaining their connection to home.

Campbell begins both picturebooks with peritextual essays that provide brief histories of IRS in Canada to historically ground her narratives. The essays are one method of speaking to implied readers with diverse levels of knowledge, but also communicate an anxiety that the picturebooks may not be fully understood without being first historically situated. This anxiety (of either the author, publisher, editor, or all) is a symptom of the ignorance that has plagued many settler Canadians and Indigenous peoples (as both can lack knowledge and suffer from the delusions of the master narrative) regarding IRS. With her essays, Campbell situates the experiences of her protagonists within the larger context and this reveals a pre-emptive (and not unwarranted) correction to potential reader responses that consider Shi-shi-etko and Shin-chi's accounts as purely fiction and/or as an exceptional account rather than one that is indicative of experiences shared by many Indigenous people.

Through the language of the peritextual essays, Campbell encourages readers to conduct an empathetically unsettled reading in which they imagine themselves in the place of the IRS students. Campbell invites readers to "[i]magine North America without buildings, cars and electricity. . . . *Your* people live by their own rules and take care of their families and communities. As a child, *you* are surrounded by the love of your family and community" (*Shin-chi,* emphasis added). Campbell further invites implied readers to imagine what effects IRS had upon Indigenous communities by asking readers, "Can *you* imagine a community without

children? Can *you* imagine children without parents?" (*Shi-shi-etko,* emphasis added). By encouraging readers to imagine themselves in the situation presented in the narrative, Campbell invites readers to consider another's pain. Campbell follows the invitation to imagine the trauma of another by negating any drive readers may have to appropriate pain by removing pain from the reader to the survivors of IRS: "The effects of the residential school system continue to hurt native people today" (*Shi-shi-etko*). The way in which Campbell frames and grounds her narratives insists upon their veracity and is a political statement that "challenges the settlers' delusions and promotes them to rethink their collective myth" (Episkenew 70). Thus, the essays encourage readers to enter the narratives in a state of being empathetically unsettled from the settler narratives regarding IRS.

Memory is the fundamental tool Shi-shi-etko and Shin-chi use to resist the pedagogy of assimilation and maintain a strong connection to their cultural selves. William Bevis notes it is a common characteristic in Indigenous novels for characters to go home mentally (through memory) when it is not physically possible to return home. Bevis labels this use of memory "homing in," and he argues it allows characters to maintain a sense of belonging to their selves, families, and culture (581). Ruana Kuokkanen argues that Bevis's concept of "homing in" within Indigenous literature demonstrates characters' "living and continuing connection to [their] cultural heritage and background" (717). "Homing in" involves active remembrance to combat forgetting and creates a mental space of home within the oppressive space of school.

The siblings resist their school's pedagogical and disciplinary structures' attempts to disconnect them from their family by "homing in" while at school. The siblings prepare "material" or memories with which to "home in" at school by intentionally and repeatedly looking "at everything" in order to "memorize" their home (*Shi-shi-etko* and *Shin-chi)*. Shi-shi-

etko combines a physical performance with her mental work of memorization in the physical act of hiding her memories. Shi-shi-etko fills the deer-hide bag (given to her by her grandmother) with physical representations of her memories (sprigs of fir, hemlock, cedar, and pine tree), and buries the bag at the foot of a pine tree before leaving for school. Shi-shi-etko knows her memories, and the symbolic and material representations of them, will not be safe at school, and thus she invites the earth to be the safe-keeper and protector of her memories. Hiding her memories makes it impossible for the school to steal them and is a tactic that defies and subverts the disciplinary processes of the school.

Where Shi-shi-etko physically hides material representations of her memories, Shin-chi creates a bedtime ritual of "homing in" by chanting lessons and traditional knowledge he wants to remember. The school attempts to disconnect Shin-chi from his family by erasing cultural knowledge and replacing it with rudimentary Western knowledge. The erasure and replacement are emphasized throughout IRS narratives generally. In David A. Robertson's graphic novel *7 Generations: A Plains Cree Sage* (2012) the protagonist speaks to the erasure of cultural memory in that he "went to school but what did I learn? Seems like I unlearned things" (80). Similarly, in Shirley Sterling's *My Name is Seepteeza* (1998), family members argue against Seepteezea being sent to school because "school would turn them [the children] into white people. They wouldn't be able to hunt or fish or make baskets or anything *useful* anymore" (30). Shin-chi resists the erasure of cultural knowledge by chanting lessons from his father that combine knowledge of fish migration to when Shin-chi will return home for the summer holidays: "Dad said the spring salmon come up the river first, then the sockeye come in the summertime. That's when we can go home" (*Shin-Chi*). The chanted lesson not only calms Shin-chi with the awareness that he will eventually return home, but aids in maintaining valuable knowledge that will contribute to his

being a useful member of his cultural community, and it creates a mental space for home that appropriates the space of the school.

In *Shin-chi's Canoe*, Shi-shi-etko further practises survivance by creating a haircutting ritual performed before leaving for school and that is a loving act performed by her Yayah. Without exception, the ritual of cutting Indigenous children's hair upon arrival at school is detailed in children's picturebooks and novels about IRS (this is true of all the texts discussed and mentioned in this chapter). For example, in Jenny Kay Dupuis and Kathy Kacer's *I Am Not a Number* (2016), the protagonist explains that "[t]his meant much more to me than a haircut" because "[b]ack home, long hair was a source of pride. We cut it when we lost a loved one" (Dupuis and Kacer). Robertson's graphic novel *Sugar Falls* (2011) depicts over two pages Betsy's violent bath "to get the 'dirt' off" (1.1.19), and her haircut at the hands of a grim-faced nun. Betsy wonders if being "scrubbed violently . . . until my skin was sore and red" (2.1.19), or having "my beautiful long hair" cut "hurt more" (3.2.19). In these and other examples, the haircuts are a ritualistic and physical representation of White adult administrators' attempts to remove pride from Indigenous student bodies and replace it with shame. Shi-shi-etko transforms the school's demeaning ritual into a loving act performed by her Yayah that strengthens, rather than severs, their bond.

The siblings' acts of remembrances and "homing in" are rebellions against the school space that challenge the intended pedagogical processes of cultural erasure/genocide. Their tactics are subtle and performed outside the gaze of school authority figures (bedtime chants, hiding memories at home, haircuts before coming to school), and are acts of survivance in which the siblings survive their school experience by relying on their natural and cultural knowledge. Similar to *When I Was Eight* and *Not My Girl*, Campbell and LaFave do not fully do justice to

the survivance of their protagonists in their limited portrayal of the trauma at the schools. Erasing the physical, psychological, and sexual abuses that students routinely experienced in the schools, and focusing instead solely on the characters' abilities to remember, does not fully represent the challenges the protagonists would have faced at the school and limits the depiction of their survivance.

Generational Survivance

One of the greatest roadblocks to reconciliation is some settlers' insistence that IRS are a historical problem with no legacy in our present, which disavows the lasting consequences of the atrocities committed by the schools and of the many federal policies that continue to discriminate. Isolating the atrocities of the schools to the past negates the need for changed settler attitudes and behaviours. The last IRS was closed in 1996, which can seem like a lifetime ago to an implied six- and seven-year-old reader of these picturebooks, and this makes it essential to establish the consequences of the IRS as a current and future issue, rather than a historical atrocity solely restricted to the past. For Indigenous readers, some of whom are the children and grandchildren of IRS survivors, the connection between the past, present, and future demonstrates the need to become involved in their communities, and understanding can create deeper relationships between generations. The picturebook *When We Were Alone* (2016) written by David A. Robertson and illustrated by Julie Flett takes place in the present and represents an Indigenous child's relationship with her grandmother who is an IRS survivor. The narrative situates the atrocities of IRS as reaching firmly into our present, and as continuing into our future if behaviours and attitudes are not changed. The picturebooks by the Fentons, Grimard, Campbell, and LaFave provide histories that focus on the triumphs of protagonists that restory

settler myths, and the picturebook by Robertson and Flett provides urgency to young Indigenous and non-Indigenous readers that speaks to the significance of the IRS history to our shared present and future. But, similar to the picturebooks previously discussed, *When We Were Alone* focuses on the forced separation of children from their families and does not confront the other abuses committed against children at the schools, and this undercuts the survivance of the protagonist. Presenting a more transparent account of the atrocities committed at the schools would make a stronger argument for why their legacies reach so firmly into our present and future.

The picturebook is framed by questioned asked by a granddaughter to her Kókom, an IRS survivor. An unnamed young girl gardens with her Kókom (grandmother) and begins to notice things about her Kókom that make her curious. The granddaughter asks in succession why her Kókom dresses so colourfully, wears her hair so long, speaks in Cree, and spends so much time with her brother. Kókom's answers are tied to her childhood experience of attending IRS and her answers reveal the sustained ways Kókom has rebelled against the assimilation agenda of the school, and of settler society generally, by unabashedly embracing her cultural knowledge and traditions. The picturebook emphasizes, as Fagan calls for, "the ways in which Indigenous people have gone on, even in the face of great challenges" and focuses not on what is lost, but what is retained through survivance ("Response"). Yet, like the other picturebooks in this chapter, a full account of the "great challenges" that Kókom would have faced is not supplied.

To answer her granddaughter's first question of why she dresses colourfully, Kókom explains that at home she and her friends wore many colours, but at school they were stripped of individuality and forced to dress in dark clothes so that "we all mixed together like storm clouds" (*Alone*). During the fall, when alone, the children subvert the school's mandate that they should

"look like everybody else" by covering themselves with fall leaves to be "colourful again" (*Alone*). As an adult, Kókom continues to reject the school's disciplinary tactics meant to assimilate her by always wearing "the most beautiful colours" (*Alone*). To answer why she wears her hair long, Kókom states that the long hair that made her feel "strong and proud" was cut off at school because the teachers "didn't like that we were proud" (*Alone*). In the spring, the children braid strands of long and thick grass into their hair to resist the ritual intended to sever their pride. In both instances the natural world provides the children means of physically representing their pride and cultural individuality, and of briefly restoring what the school and its adult administrators had taken away from the children in order to assimilate them. The leaves and grass are the material means children use to enact their survivance. Both dressing themselves with colourful leaves and weaving grass into their shorn hair are secret practices afforded by nature that maintain cultural identity, resist the assimilation pedagogy of the school, "home in," and reappropriate the school space (temporarily) to meet the students' needs.

Kókom shares with her granddaughter that her teachers would not let students speak Cree, only "*their* strange words," but that when alone outside in the summer "we would whisper to each other in Cree. We would say all the words we weren't allowed to say so that we wouldn't forget them" (*Alone*). Outside, but in close proximity to the enclosed school space, the students resist being made docile by the space by covertly running counter-lessons in outdoor classrooms that oppose the indoor classrooms' attempts to obliterate cultural and traditional knowledge. Lastly, Kókom explains that siblings were separated at school because "they didn't like when we were with family . . . because when we were together we thought too much of home," but in the winter Kókom would find her brother outside where the teachers could not see them, and they would take off their mittens and hold hands, and now "I'm always with my family" (*Alone*).

Once again, by momentarily being outside of the enclosed space of the school, the children evade the oppressive gaze (facilitated by the space being enclosed) of the adult administrators. The cold weather keeps away oppressive authority figures and opens the opportunity for physical closeness with family, and this closeness creates a subversive space that fosters memories of home in close proximity to a disciplinary one that sought to sever familial connections. In each example, the seasons provide outlets for the students' varied rebellious tactics that subvert the assimilation pedagogy of the school and to maintain students' cultural practices and identities.

The fifth and most covert rebellion is the way Robertson and Flett represent the settler school administrators. The picturebook further challenges the authority of those who ran the schools by visually erasing them from the narrative and refusing to name them. Just as names were taken from Indigenous children, the settler administrators are not named or given any designation other than "teacher" or the undistinguishable term of "they" (*Alone*). In this instance, the author and illustrator reverse the shame-inducing pedagogy of the IRS towards adult administrators of the schools. Sarah Ahmed defines shame as "an intense and painful sensation that is bound up with how the self feels about itself. . . . When I feel shame, I have done something that I feel is bad" (*Politics* 103). Robertson and Fleet are strategic in their choices of "what their readers need to know" (Kertzer 14), and rather than focus on physical abuse they depict the procedural entry policies upon arrival at the schools that were directed at replacing students' pride with shame. Kókom is forced to exchange her warm, colourful, and lovingly made clothing for ill-fitting, school-supplied clothing and her long hair is cut short. Each practice is meant to strip Kókom not only of her cultural identity and individuality, but also to impose shame upon her perception of herself, her family, and culture because of their differences from the assumed "superiority" of Canadian settler culture.

Shame involves feeling exposed and vulnerable to another and it is intensified by being seen by others, and the abusive entry protocols Kókom endures are structured upon the notion of students being "seen" by the settler "Other" (in this case, teachers and administrators) and feeling vulnerable in their exposure. Ahmed notes that feeling exposed and vulnerable can produce a desire to hide, and from that desire the subject turns away from the object of shame—most often from her or himself—and is "consumed with feelings of badness that cannot be attributed to another" (*Cultural Politics* 104). Ahmed describes the feelings of disgust, which stem from shame, as culminating in the following thought process: '"I feel myself to be bad, and hence to expel the badness, I have to expel myself from myself,"' and thus "the subject's movement back into itself is simultaneously a turning away from itself" (*Politics* 104). Indigenous students were in this way made to "feel bad about themselves" through IRS practices of reassigning names or giving children numbers in place of names, cutting their braids, and forbidding them from using their Indigenous languages and cultural practices. To expel this "badness," teachers and administrators encouraged students to "turn away" from what they had been made ashamed of (themselves, their families, and their cultures), and to embrace what the pedagogy of the schools touted as the antidote to shame: hiding one's Indigenous culture and embracing the values and ideologies of the colonizers. It is this outcome of shame (expulsion and turning away) that the IRS counted on to achieve the cultural genocide of their Indigenous students.

Robertson and Flett's picturebook opposes shame in Kókom's sustained reliance on her cultural identity, and shame is instead directed at the teachers and administrators through the text and images representing the abuses against Kókom (such as the haircut, which is textually and visually represented) and her peers. Although, similar to the other picturebooks discussed, Flett

and Robinson do not fully confront the abuses committed by the school administrators and teachers. Flett visually depicts an administrator only once: a white woman in grey clothes is seen from behind as she cuts off Kókom's braids. Flett does not depict the face of this teacher/administrator and this removes individuality from the figure, and she stands as a symbol for all school teachers/administrators. Yet, the removal of Kókom's braids is only an initiation to the abuses and cultural genocide children at the schools experienced, and Roberston and Flett do not confront these deeper realities. In visually excluding the settler teachers and administrators from the narrative, the abuses committed by them remain on the peripheries with them.

Robertson and Flett focus on what Kókom retains through creative subversions rather than focusing on what she may have lost. Kókom's present behaviour is a testament to the success of her childhood rebellions, although her subversions and rebellions would be made all the more profound with fuller depictions of the challenges she would have faced. She continues to subvert the assimilation agenda of the school space and settler culture in that by retaining her cultural knowledge and familial relationships she is able to model them to her granddaughter, a future generation, further opposing the erasure of Indigenous peoples and culture in the present and future and protects her granddaughter from carrying on the acceptance of shame. However, Robertson and Flett's anxieties over representing historical trauma to young audiences, as quoted earlier in this chapter, result in their ultimately turning away from rather than fully confronting the atrocities, leaving implied readers with limited knowledge of the full atrocities committed at the schools.

Conclusion

The IRS picturebooks' protagonists triumph over the IRS with acts of survivance. The student characters' triumphs begin to restory false settler narratives about the history and legacy of IRS and this unsettles young readers from adopting or sustaining prejudiced behaviours that threaten reconciliation of Indigenous peoples and settler Canadians. In being unsettled from the settler narratives through reading survivance narratives, young readers are implicated in the project of reconciliation because their attitudes and behaviours going forward will determine the success or failure of reconciliation between non-Indigenous and Indigenous peoples. But are young readers given enough information to significantly engage with reconciliation?

The authors and illustrators of these IRS stories do not valorize the ideological structures of the school space, nor do they hope that the ethos of the schools will be transmitted to readers to aid in their own moral and character education. Rather, these authors and illustrators begin to uncover the oppressive natures of the IRS spaces and represent them as sites of atrocity and genocide. However, the authors and illustrators could go further in tearing down prior settler conceptions of IRS. The picturebooks' do debunk of the myth that Indigenous children benefitted from or even needed a Western education, and the characters triumph in maintaining connections to home all contribute to unsettling settler narratives regarding IRS. But these picturebooks could do more to push against the ignorance and dismissal of the IRS by positioning their young readers as more capable of handling representations of trauma, and, in doing so, readers would be more fully implicated in the reconciliation project to establish compassionate and respectful relationships between Indigenous peoples and settlers, which is the needed foundation for the possibility of reconciliation to become a reality.

Chapter Four

The "Exit" Option:

Young Adult Lethal Violence School Stories

> "[H]e doesn't have to worry about whether he's a freak or a geek, a grind or a jock or a nerd. He doesn't have to worry if he's gay. He's a murderer. It's marvelously unambiguous."
>
> —Lionel Shriver, *We Need to Talk About Kevin*

Instances of violence in schools have been recorded throughout the history of institutionalized education, and school violence includes a wide range of actions often charged with sexist, homophobic, racist, and cultural prejudices that seek to suppress and dominate peers. Malicious gossip, verbal harassment, sexual harassment, social exclusion, physical assault, suicide, and homicide all fall under the umbrella of school violence. The most common form of violence documented and associated with the school space is peer bullying, which was first institutionalized by Victorian public-school disciplinary structure of "fagging".[48] Bullies are individuals or groups who engage in specific types of aggression (from physical abuse to verbal taunts and gossip) repeatedly and with harmful intent against another individual or group. Since the eighteenth century, a "bully" has been defined as "a tyrannical coward who makes himself a terror to the weak" ("bully," n.1, II. 3. A.) and one who uses tactics such as "overbearing insolence; personal intimidation; petty tyranny" ("bullying, n"). Bullying became intertwined

[48] It is essential to understand that school violence includes, but is not limited to, bullying. Bullying is *repeated* aggression against a group/individual, and many school acts of violence are isolated events. For example, lethal school violence, such as homicide and suicide, while possibly influenced by bullying, is not an example of bullying because the event is not repetitive.

with school life, childhood, and adolescence in the nineteenth century, when the action was "often used with reference to schoolboy life" ("bullying, n.").

Peer bullying has been a conventional plot device in school stories from their origins. Sarah Fielding's *The Governess* (1749) opens with a school-wide fight over an apple and who ought to eat it. When words fail, the girls regress to the "pulling of Caps, tearing of Hair, and dragging the Cloaths off one another's Backs . . . [and they] endeavor[ed] to scratch and pinch their Enemies" (Fielding 52). In Thomas Hughes's *Tom Brown's Schooldays* (1857), Flashman, "the School-house bully" (Hughes 106), tyrannically controls younger boys and leaves "no slander unspoken, and no deed undone, which could in any way hurt his victims, or isolate them from the rest of the house" (Hughes 178). In his pinnacle act of violence, Flashman forcefully holds Tom in front of a roaring fireplace, pulls down Tom's trousers, and burns his legs (Hughes 183). Both instances function as vital events in the protagonists' character formations. In *Governess*, the violence inspires the series of stories told by each student over several days in an effort to better understand one another, and this transforms the school into a utopian space of female support where everyone is treated with dignity and respect. In *Schooldays*, Tom is moulded into a just leader through his confrontations with Flashman. Tom's moral growth is evident when a group of younger boys is united under Tom and fights back when Flashman attempts bullying behaviours. In both texts, as in many Golden Age school stories, bullies and bullying are transparently represented as despicable behaviour not to be emulated by readers. The quick expulsion of bullies (as in *Tom Brown*) or the great remorse of rehabilitated bullies (as in *Governess*) offer heavy-handed lessons against school violence.

Peer violence and bullying continue to be identified with school experiences and are prevalent in school stories. Yet, in many post-Golden Age school stories bullies rarely receive

their comeuppance, nor are they expelled from the school. In R. J. Palacio's *Wonder* (2012), for example, an elementary school principal attempts to suspend a student for slipping notes with hateful messages such as "*everybody hates you*" (198), and "*get out of our school, orc*" (208), into another student's locker. The bully's parents are offended by the suggestion of a suspension and they remove their son from the school. While the bully is removed from the school, it is done by his parents to protect him from punishment and in a manner that denies there is any fault in his behaviour. Similarly, in Sharon M. Draper's *Out of My Mind* (2010), Melody, who has Cerebral Palsy, is ignored and excluded by her able-bodied peers. Melody's classmates do not change their behaviour during the course of the novel, nor are they reprimanded for their cruel exclusion practices—indeed, even the teachers take part in the exclusion—and Melody withdraws into the "special needs" classroom where she feels accepted.

Palacio's and Draper's protagonists are considered to be worthless and dispensable by their bullies. The two narratives do not endorse the behaviours of the bullies but construct the narratives to encourage sympathy and empathy for the bullied characters, such as by focalizing the novels with the first-person narrations of bullied characters; however, the lack of consequences ultimately positions bullying and aggressive behaviours as acceptable within the societies of the novels. Just as public-school stories are time capsules that represent the hegemonically produced school spaces of nineteenth-century Britain, school stories like Palacio's and Draper's reflect a socio-cultural shift to the cultures of cruelty that are fueled by the corporate competition of neoliberalism.[49] Henry Giroux describes neoliberalism's interests as

[49] Andrew Vincent defines neoliberalism's basic tenet as the identification of "the unregulated free-market capitalist order as the crucial ground for all efficient resource allocation. It is highly individualistic, intrinsically suspicious of all collective state or trade unions' actions, and deeply uneasy with all forms of welfare policy premised on the state" (337). Stephen Metcalf argues that neoliberalism is more than a name for "pro-market policies" but "has come to regulate all we

> . . . freeing markets from social constraints, fueling competitiveness, destroying educational systems, produced atomized subjects, and loosening individuals from any sense of social responsibility [that] prepare the populace for a slow embrace of social Darwinism, state terrorism, and the mentality of war. (*Education* 15)

Such a neoliberal cultural hegemony produces school spaces with disciplinary structures that support bullying and other forms of school violence because such behaviours prepare students for success in a competitive capitalist society. This socio-cultural shift from British imperialism to competitive neoliberalism is reflected in the representation of bullying and school violence in school stories as an unfortunate reality that characters (and implied readers) must learn to withstand if they are to survive not only their school years, but to prosper in their adult lives.

A change took place in the school story subgenre in the wake of the 20th April 1999 rampage shooting at Columbine High School in Littleton, Colorado. An exclusive subset within young adult (YA) school stories emerged in which victimized student characters take school discipline into their own hands and commit lethal acts of violence against their peers, their schools, and themselves.[50] Michael Cart argues that:

> [I]f any good thing came out of Columbine it was the elevation of attention to this epidemic problem and the very rapid emergence of a subgenre of young adult literature that continues to explore the many aspects of this issue with insight and empathy. (113) [51]

---

practise and believe: that competition is the only legitimate organising principle for human activity" ("Neoliberalism").

[50] Rampage shootings are defined as attacks on multiple parties selected mostly at random (Newman et al. 15). Katherine S. Newman et al. were the first to do a systematic study on school shootings in *Rampage* (2004), and scholars have continued to use the term "rampage" to describe mass casualty lethal violence.

[51] Cart's statement is significant in his use of "epidemic" to describe lethal school violence, as it is reflective of the moral panic responses often stimulated by media coverage of events to these inexplicable violent attacks. Many scholars argue against rampage shootings being considered an

Cart's description of these texts is accurate, but rather than their forming a subgenre of YA, I categorize them as a subset of the school story subgenre because the school setting functions as the main and most pivotal site of action, and lethal violence is represented as aggravated by students' experiences within the school space. Lethal violence school stories participate in traditional conventions of the subgenre and expand the subgenre by criticizing the social structures encouraged by neoliberal, hegemonically produced school spaces as being aggravators in school violence and, more generally, in fostering toxic and competitive peer relationships.

Opting Out of the Nonviolence Contract

For Stanley Aronowitz, the Columbine massacre and lethal school violence generally represent the failure of the democratic nonviolent social contract, which is aggrieved citizens' rights to air their injustices and have them mediated by elected and judicial representatives. The nonviolence contract propagates the narrative that "in exchange for renouncing force as a means of resolving differences individuals and groups submit to the rules of 'law' which *assure justice* and *restricts the arbitrary exercise of authority*" (Aronowitz 217, emphasis added). Aronowitz contends that lethal school violence is one piece of evidence that citizens are increasingly "opting out" of the social contract that denunciates violence. Why would citizens opt out of a contract that promises justice when one is wronged? Aronowitz answers that nonviolent social contracts are "losing their suasion" because "they are increasingly projected by the school . . . as a cultural *ideal* rather

---

epidemic (Mark Moore et al., Newman et al., Denmark et al., Fast), because schools statistically remain the safest location for young people, meaning schools are the least likely location for young people to have violent deaths. Mark Moore et al. note that children are more likely to be killed or seriously injured outside of school, and in a study by the Centres for Disease Control and Prevention on American youth aged five to eighteen in 2012-2013, only 2.6 percent of youth homicides occurred at school.

than a practical model" (219). Put differently, the contract does not in practice guarantee justice, nor does it restrict the indiscriminate use of authority. Aronowitz uses the example of a student hailed with malicious intent, "[H]ey faggot" while walking down the halls of his school. According to the nonviolence contract, rather than retaliating with violence which would escalate the conflict, the victim should express his feelings of hurt to the offender. The victim also has the right to ask for an apology, and if refused, has the additional right to report the incident to proper authorities who will aid in the victim in gaining redress. The offender, realizing the hurt he or she caused, will gladly apologize and not repeat the offence. This, however, is not the reality in many school spaces.

Julia Webber engages with and expands Aronowitz's arguments and explains that the nonviolent ideal touted as governing conflict resolution in school spaces (and democratic societies at large) can breed shame in students through their compliance with the system. Both Webber and Aronowitz read school violence, using Columbine as a concrete example, as evidence of the difficulty of living on the margins of a society that "demands loyalty" even when it fails to provide space for marginalized voices (Aronowitz 220). When injustices are met without reparation, and authority figures favour one type of student over another, all the while claiming to practice nonviolence conflict resolutions,

> . . . subjects [students] are forced to act as if they are agents in a free system that gave them a choice in joining the social contract. . . . [T]his shame, if highlighted by continued humiliation in public spaces such as schools . . . spirals out of control into rage as students are publicly assailed and taunted with their powerlessness by those who have . . . the protection of the authorities. (Webber 105)

Rather than promoting nonviolence, Ralph Larkin finds that the civics lesson taught to students in schools is that "might makes right, that some citizens are more worthy than others, and that those who express dissent with the dominant perspective . . . deserve predation, *get what they deserve*, and have no claim to dignity" (*Comprehending* 120, emphasis added). Larkin's observations align with Giroux's argument that neoliberal ethics collapse public issues into the personal (problems are reduced to character), and this represents a "refusal to translate private issues into larger systemic considerations. . . . [I]t forces upon people the horrible assumption that whatever they have to confront *they have to blame themselves for*" ("Conversation", emphasis added). The neoliberal systems Larkin and Giroux describe run directly counter to the social contract of nonviolent resolution, and students who face daily pain and humiliation in schools have no true option of voice or participation.

When "unable to project a future and stuck in an interminable present that presents itself as utopia" some subjects choose to opt out of participation by exiting the system (Webber 88). Michel de Certeau and Henri Lefebvre argue that bodies have the ability to live actively within hegemonically produced spaces, and citizens always have a choice of how to participate in systems of society. Those who engage in lethal school violence make a meaningful choice to exit the system: they protest and rebel by forfeiting the "social contract that rests on the refusal of violence for solving conflicts" (Webber 103). The exit option entails determining one has no place within the systems of power and renouncing one's right to participate in them. Renouncing the system is not enough, for the system is so pervasive that the only way truly to exit the system is to cease living. Aronowitz and Webber consider lethal school violence that ends with the suicide of the perpetrators (a common trend in rampage school shootings following Columbine and in lethal violence school stories) as choosing to exit the system. The lethal violence that

accompanies their exits functions as rebellions, political acts, and revenge against "a particular form of existence" that intends to provoke scrutiny of institutional systems of power (Webber 117).

Perpetrators of lethal school violence in adult-authored YA fiction choose to exit oppressive school spaces through attempted or successful suicides.[52] The violence towards the architectural school space and perpetrators' peers preceding their "exits" functions as rebellious tactics against oppressive school structures, and as dark political acts intended to exact revenge against the systems they believe facilitated their pain and humiliation. YA lethal violence novels by no means valorize the exit option, nor the violence which precedes it, but explore these brutal rebellions and political tactics act to deconstruct the oppressive structures of school spaces. Just as the picturebooks about Canadian residential schools "restory" settler myths through the unsettlement of readers, YA lethal violence texts encourage empathetic readings that urge readers to reconsider common singular narratives of acts of lethal violence as extreme cases committed by evil and/or mentally unstable individuals. Webber argues that these singular narratives go largely unquestioned because they "exonerate the homogenous social, that is . . . the school" (28). YA lethal violence novels attempt to consider the "homogenous social" of the

[52] I have chosen to focus on representations of lethal violence in adult-authored YA fiction as this is where narratives of this nature have most proliferated. While not within the scope of this chapter to fully discuss, the reasons this subject matter is not as prevalent in children's novels and picturebooks are most likely connected to questions of what is "age-appropriate," as discussed in Chapter Three. The picturebooks *I'm Not Scared . . . I'm Prepared* (2014) by Julia Cook and illustrated by Michelle Hazelwood Hyde, and *The Lockdown Drill* (2016) by Becky Coyle and illustrated by Juanbjuan Olivern demonstrate the different expectations of children's versus YA literature. The picturebooks provide procedural instructions intended to alleviate implied readers' fears, whereas the YA lethal school stories attempt to create empathy for shooters and implicate implied readers in creating the cultures of cruelty that aggravate school shootings.

school space and implicate readers' culpability in creating similar atmospheres within their own schools by either engaging in bullying behaviour or acting as bystanders to bullying practices.

Creating empathy for the perpetrator of lethal school violence, and others who routinely experience school violence, remains the final moral goal of the texts. The focus on bullying and the school environment does important work of questioning the "homogenous social" of school spaces, but doing so also oversimplifies the multifaceted influences that lead to lethal school violence and fails to fully consider the macrocosm that produces the social structures of school spaces. Just as neoliberal ethics reduce public issues to that of the individual, the YA lethal violence novels ultimately position readers as the ones/individuals to blame for continued school violence. Giroux argues that lethal school violence cannot be "abstracted" from the

> . . . death of the social, which involves the collapse of an investment in the public good, the ongoing destruction of democratic values, and the undermining of the common good. A toxic mix of rugged individualism, untrammeled self-interest, privatization, commodification and culture of fear now shapes American society, leaving most people isolated, *unaware of the broader systemic forces shaping their lives*, and trapped in a landscape of uncertainty. ("Killing Children", emphasis added)

The lethal violence school stories illuminate the cultural neoliberal hegemonic structures that support school violence in their close examination of peer relationships in school spaces, but they fail to meaningfully link these social structures to the broader systemic forces, or public issues, of "adult" society that have produced the school spaces. Thus, while the texts are radical in nature due to the subject matter and considerations of school spaces, the surface ideologies of the texts are also conservative in not fully connecting the conditions of their represented school spaces to the macrocosm that has produced them. In other words, in the novels' attempts to

challenge neoliberal competitive culture within students' peer relationships, neoliberal ethics prevail in that public issues continue to be made personal and dislocated from their systemic roots. The IRS picturebooks encourage reading practices that develop empathy that unsettles implied readers, and in this unsettlement are politicized by being implicated in the project of reconciliation. Lethal violence school stories also encourage empathy and are radical in their criticism of school spaces, but, unlike the IRS picturebooks, they stop short of politicizing implied readers in their potential to be active citizens who have the right to push against the broader systemic structures (such as gun laws) that contribute to school violence.

Prior to analyzing lethal violence school stories, I will conduct an examination of the common social structures of school spaces through the lens of Pierre Bourdieu's arguments about symbolic power and violence and Michel Foucault's examination of the societies of spectacle and surveillance. I use Bourdieu's and Foucault's concepts in tandem to enable an understanding of the neoliberal competitive nature of the social space in the represented schools that is predicated on a "winners versus losers" system. The texts represent the "losers" as excluded and deemed unworthy of recourse, and depict the ways that this aggravates some to reject nonviolence in order to exit the system that discriminated against and suppressed them. In the last portion of the chapter I focus on a group of lethal violence school stories. I begin with a categorization of the texts into two groups that reveal the shared themes and conventions among the novels in this subset of the subgenre. I then detail how the disciplinary structures of the school spaces' power and hierarchical social structures are represented in lethal violence school stories. Athletes hold the uppermost position in the social caste system through their daily and habitual violence, and these students disregard the same nonviolent resolution social contract that daily protects them from retribution from adult authority. In Chapter Two, Arnold Lunn and Alec

Waugh rejected the "tyranny of the playing fields" that dominated public schools and the stories about them. Lethal violence school stories likewise find athletics as greatly contributing to the competitive cultures of cruelty in school spaces, and the novels uniformly reject this system in favour of more compassionate peer relationships. I conclude the chapter with an examination of the violent exits of victimized student-characters and unpack the meaning/political statements behind the chosen spaces and bodies marked for violence. In detailing the oppressive nature of the school space, authors invite empathy for the perpetrators and cast lethal violence as a rebellion against the systems that foster oppression. Implied readers are positioned by the authors as those responsible for school violence, as any future violence is linked solely to peer relationships within school spaces. Laying the responsibility of stopping or sustaining school violence solely on student characters and implied readers alleviates blame from adult society (neoliberal capitalism) for its contributions to school violence, diminishes public issues to that of the personal, and continues to exclude youth from the political systems that structure their lives.

Bourdieu, Foucault, and the Construction of Winners Versus Losers

Matt Stone, co-creator of the animated televisions series *South Park* and the Broadway musical *The Book of Mormon*, was interviewed by Michael Moore in his documentary *Bowling for Columbine* (2002), which examined the societal structures in place that Moore argued made the 1999 rampage at Columbine High School possible. Moore interviews Stone because he grew up in Littleton and attended Evergreen High School, Columbine's rival high school. Stone remembers his high school experience as being "painfully normal" in that he believed his life in high school, being a microcosm of adult society, was indicative of what his experience outside of high school would be: "[T]hey [teachers, counsellors, principals] scare you into conforming and

doing good in school by saying: 'if you're a loser now, you're gonna be a loser forever'" (Moore). Stone compares his feelings of entrapment to what he imagines the Columbine shooters, Eric Harris and Dylan Klebold, must have felt. Stone interprets the fact that Harris and Klebold were two weeks from graduation when the rampage took place as signalling their belief that life outside of high school would be no different from life within. Stone's comments cast high school as a microcosm influenced by outside structures, but also a miniature world unto itself with its own heightened divisions along lines of gender, sexuality, race, culture, and class. Though anecdotal, Stone's interview begins to illuminate and capture the consequences of school spaces being conceived of as a microcosm of larger society in which one's success depends on both the ability to do better than others (be a winner, not a loser), and concurrently conform to neoliberal hegemonic standards of success.

The high school social structure described by Stone, which is also present in the lethal violence school stories, aligns with Bourdieu's concepts of symbolic power and violence. Bourdieu argues that symbolic power consists of invisible forms of discipline that govern and structure social hierarchies and tend to value certain characteristics over others. Foucault likewise perceives that disciplinary structures and practices enforce "artificial order[s]" that are put in place by a space's laws and regulations that are naturalized through "observable processes" (179). Those who do not observe the artificial order of the space are punished, and this makes nonconformity to the symbolic powers "punishable" (Foucault 179). For Bourdieu, the punishment for nonconformity is symbolic violence, which takes place when one operates under the assumption that social hierarchies are natural and then imposes that view onto others. According to Bourdieu, the relationship between symbolic power and violence involves "making

people see and believe, of confirming or transforming the visions of the world and thus the world itself" (*Language* 170).

All the texts discussed in this chapter take place in North America during the twentieth and twenty-first centuries, and they uniformly reflect the social, cultural, and economic values of a larger neoliberal culture that embraces a "corporate vision . . . [that] has reduced the culture of schooling to the culture of business and an armed camp, and in doing so, impose a real and symbolic threat of violence on schools, teachers and students" (Giroux, "Striking"). The values of competition, individualism, commodification, and aggression are embodied in the hegemonically produced school spaces and influence the relation of bodies to one another in the space. Binary hierarchies are established that consist of those who maintain the hegemonic standards (in this case, of neoliberalism) of symbolic power that regulate the space, and those who do not, or cannot, conform. The non-conformer is disciplined and punished by those who conform through symbolic violence, which simultaneously validates the conformers' power and subjugates the non-conformer. The symbolic power and disciplinary structures of the represented school spaces are constructed on hegemonic society's neoliberal and capitalist values, setting up the expectation that those who succeed at conforming inside of school will have continued success outside.

In lethal violence school stories, the socialization process and construction of student characters' relationships within school spaces is predicated on an "us versus them" pedagogy, in which students continually define and compare where one does and does not belong. In an examination of ethnic-based violence in American high schools, Martín Sánchez-Jankowski notes that "[g]roup history can be effective in building personal identity and a positive self-image"; however, "it is also effective in building a worldview that divides people into 'we' and

'they'. . . and forming prejudice that is essential in initiating the sustaining social conflict between groups" (41-2). To determine who belongs in the "us" and "them" groups, the school space produces and reproduces social hierarchies of a neoliberal hegemonic society that measure students' ability to perform the ideal gendered (cisgendered: masculine if male, and feminine if female), sexual (heterosexual), economic (middle to upper class), and racial (white-European) identities. The represented school spaces groom students for success in a competitive capitalist system, and it is a rewarded practice to commit violence against marginalized others in order to dispose of and disempower them. The relationship between "us" and "them" is grounded in a competitive spirit: as Michael Lerner argues, school "teaches students that their own success depends on their ability to do better than others, thus further eliminating a sense of connection to others and exacerbating the alienation already experienced in other ways" (9).

Little has changed regarding the prominent place of athletics in school stories, and the competitive spirit between students has been celebrated throughout the school story subgenre. The most common example within school stories is when athletes hold the top social position within the school space, which is naturalized through the valorization of athletes in larger society and by adult authorities in the school space. The competitive foundation of peer relationships is evident in *Tom Brown* during the chapters that closely detail several rugby games and the emotional and relational consequences of these games on the relationships of students. Significantly, the "us versus them" mentality is interrogated in Lunn's *The Harrovians* and Waugh's *The Loom of Youth*, in which students are socialized to be obedient and unquestioning soldiers on the playing fields and enter battle knowing little about what has driven them to war beyond their need to win. Lunn and Waugh critique the "tyranny of athletics" in favour of autonomous and student-led education models that foster critical thinking instead of the blind

obedience athletics teaches. The lethal violence school stories, in their depiction of the competitive cruelty fueled by athletics, likewise reject a social hierarchy and civic pedagogy predicated on athleticism and encourage implied readers to think more critically about the structuring structures of their school spaces. Lunn and Waugh connect school athleticism to the nation's colonial and imperial need for soldiers, and in doing so link the "tyranny of athletics" to the tyranny of British imperialism. Conversely, while they critically question competitive peer relationships, YA lethal violence school stories fail to connect competitive student relationships to the larger neoliberal systemic forces that breed them.

The competitive spirit moves beyond athletic performance in later school stories to include and encompass acceptable (by misogynistic, neoliberal, capitalist standards) performances of gendered, sexual, racial, and economic identities. Gene Luen Yang's graphic novel *American Born Chinese* (2006) offers a poignant example that succinctly illustrates a competitive identity performance that is needed to move up the school's social ladder. The protagonist, Jin, is an outcast at his school simply for being Chinese, and he endures daily racism from peers that humiliates, belittles, and excludes him. Fed up with being ostracized, Jin begins to perform a white-masculine identity. Yang visually depicts Jin's transformation in his physical makeover into a white, blue-eyed, and blond-haired youth. Alongside the physical transformation, Jin alters his identity performance: he rejects his actual name and replaces it with Danny; he dates a white girl, who looks similar to the white girl who rejects his romantic advances before his transformation; he becomes a star basketball player; and he eats only Western food. Through the rejection and suppression of his Chinese identity, Jin moves up the school's social hierarchy, and he is accepted as a result of his expertly performing a racial

(white) and cultural (European, athlete) identity validated and naturalized by the symbolic power structures that govern the space.

Victimizers versus Victims

In school stories, those at the top of the social hierarchy confirm and naturalize their own positions by punishing those who do not conform to the culture's hegemonic standards, such as the "popular" students who bully Jin with racial slurs. Within the subgenre, bullying is a key method of disciplining nonconformers and creates another significant binary that divides and orders the school space: victimizers and victims. In *Discipline and Punish*, Foucault argues that there has been a shift in the "systems of punishment" from spectacle to one of surveillance (24). A society of spectacle is one in which the many see the punishment of the few, and the many "whose real and immediate presence was required for the performance" are made aware "that the slightest offense was likely to be punished," arousing "feelings of terror by the spectacle of power" (57-8). In witnessing the public punishment of individuals, the many are disciplined into obedience through the terror of what they have witnessed.

Foucault notes that through the decline of public executions the many became individualized through surveillance in which power was "like a faceless gaze that transformed the whole social body into a field of perception; thousands of eyes posted everywhere" (214). Through the disciplinary practices detailed in his study (such as the control of activity, organization of space, and means of corrective training) the individual became "carefully fabricated" by the "panoptic machine" (217). Looking specifically at the school space, Foucault finds that the society of surveillance distributes students according to their "aptitudes and their conduct," exercising over them "a constant pressure to conform to the same model . . . so they

might be like one another" (182). The actions of the individual are constantly compared to the actions of the whole, and in which one is relentlessly measuring and being measured in a way that "hierarchizes the level and nature of individuals; introduces the constraint of a conformity that must be achieved. . . . [I]t compares, differentiates, hierarchizes, homogenizes, excludes" (182-3).

Bullying in school stories, especially YA lethal violence novels, combines the characteristics of spectacle and surveillance. Student characters continually measure themselves against members of the student body who "successfully" display the approved gendered, racial, sexual, and economic identities, and the homogenous student body acts as the surveying gaze, always evaluating. Individuals found to embody unacceptable degrees of difference are publicly punished in performances that both validate the punishers' position of power and place in the social hierarchy and terrorize the many who witness in the demonstration that the slightest form of nonconformity is likely to be punished. Performances of punishment most often take place in public spaces, such as the cafeteria during lunch, school dances, or during gym class, all where the homogenous student body may act as witnesses to the punishment of the individual who is found deficient. The spectacle establishes and confirms where bodies belong: either with the conforming "us" who victimize the marginalized, or the non-conforming "them" who are victimized as punishment for their nonconformity. Social structures represented in YA lethal violence novels are governed on the threat of punishment for nonconformity and thus operate in direct opposition to nonviolent resolutions.

YA Lethal Violence School Stories

Categories of YA Lethal Violence School Stories

YA lethal violence school stories are often heavy-handed in their didacticism and overtly convey the fictional accounts as being immediately relevant to their implied readers' lives. In Todd Strasser's *Give A Boy A Gun* (2000), Strasser follows his fictional account of a school shooting with "A Partial List of School Shootings" that highlights the age of perpetrators and (printed in bold font) the weapons used. Strasser also includes a "Final Thoughts" section where he directly appeals to readers that it is "your job to keep these ideas alive, to examine your own life and your own school" ("Final Thoughts"). Strasser both directly links his fictional narrative to actual instances of lethal school violence, possibly with the intention to provide urgency to his novel's subject matter, and he bestows implied readers with a "job" in the wake of their reading. If it is unclear to implied readers what that job is, Strasser also makes it clear that they must, going forward, "respect one another's differences" ("Final Thoughts"). Strasser's supplemental material is more direct than that of the other YA lethal school story authors, but it is largely indicative of them. In his direct address to readers, Strasser holds the student body as being accountable for school violence and he does not implicate the larger structures of adult society and culture that have produced the structures and social contexts that aggravate school violence. Like the public-school stories and polemic responses in Chapter Two, these are school stories that want to effect change in actual school spaces and improve children and youth's experiences in them. But in contrast to school stories in Chapter Two, lethal violence school stories position students/children/youth as those most responsible for school violence.

In YA lethal violence school stories, the representation of perpetrators of lethal violence and their victims can be largely organized into two categories: the narrative is told through the

first-person perspective of perpetrator(s), and the victims' perspectives are interpreted through the focalization of the perpetrator (Shepard; Garden); or lives of victims and perpetrators are both explored through first- and second-person perspectives (Strasser; Koertge; Myers; Tullson; N. Smith; Pignat; Nijkamp). The first category, in which the perpetrators' first-person perspectives are featured, attempts to humanize and produce empathy for the shooter(s) in order to aid in readers' comprehension of lethal violence. This category often constructs the school community as being culpable in lethal violence through the condoned or ignored victimization of perpetrators. The victimization of the shooters, often by bullying practices, is prevalent in these texts and implicitly links lethal school violence to bullying. Texts in this category have the tendency to oversimplify factors that contribute to school violence in their desire to have their readers empathize, and a strong focus on the school environment and bullying can blur other factors such as psychological disorders, mental health stigmas, personal family histories, societal structures and ideologies, access to weapons, and so on.

Michael Cart claims that bullying in schools is evidence of "[t]he shocking absence of empathy in today's adolescent lives," and that literature's ability to take readers into the interior lives of characters can develop empathy by "powerfully convey[ing] how what is happening feels" (132). These claims borrow strongly from the language of moral panic, and they are troubling in essentializing all adolescents as apathetic and for removing bullying from the larger societal context surrounding school spaces. In contrast, Lourdes Lopez-Ropero asserts that YA literature commonly presents bullying "not as dysfunctional adolescent behavior, but rather deploy[s] it as a metaphor for intolerance and discrimination, or as a tool for addressing issues of difference and autonomy that filter through into adolescent culture" (147). Bullying can be used as a metaphor for larger societal intolerance and discrimination and its representation opens up

space for scrutiny of the multiple structures that intensify and enable bullying practices; however, the extent to which lethal violence school stories are able to illuminate these larger structures varies.

The second category, in which the perspectives of the victims *and* perpetrators are explored, is also frequently used in YA lethal violence school stories, although the extent to which perpetrators' motivations are explored fluctuates. In this category is Diana Tullson's *Lockdown* (2008), which offers a limited perspective of the shooter. The novel opens with the shooter being bullied during science class, is presented in a way that indicates the treatment is habitual, and it provides readers with some context for the shooter's violence. The remainder of the novel focuses solely on the narrator, Adam, as he navigates the school during the shooting. In this case, the limited insight into the shooter generalizes the act of violence. In comparison, the shooter, Tyler, in Marieke Nijkamp's *This Is Where It Ends* (2016) is explored through memories of several characters such as his sister, his sister's girlfriend, and Tyler's ex-girlfriend. These different perspectives construct a well-rounded character without ever focalizing directly through Tyler's perspective. In an interview, Nijkamp explains she did not write from Tyler's first-person perspective because "for all that Tyler is a central character in this story, it's not his. . . . To me, the story always belongs to them, to the victims and survivors" ("Q&A"). Nijkamp makes the victims central to the story, and their memories provide a multi-layered and complex depiction of the shooter that does not blatantly assign a singular motive to the violence, but suggests several factors such as his mental health, his racist and sexist prejudices, his family trauma, and his having experience physical and mental abuse. Nijkamp, and others in this category, through the multiple character perspectives, gesture towards the systemic forces that aggravate school

violence—though the depth to which these broader systemic considerations are probed differs and too often skim the surface.

"For those who wore a blue and golden ribbon laws ceased to exist": The Continued Tyranny of the Bloods and Adult Compliance

The social structures in all YA lethal violence school stories are identical: the playing fields continue to reign supreme, as they have since *Tom Brown*, and athletics function as a crucial determinant in the school space's social hierarchy that is maintained by adults' compliance and endorsement of the ordering process. Similar to how public-school disciplinary structures encouraged characters' identity formation to include characteristics of chivalry, bravery, obedience, and loyalty, attributes that were valuable to Britain's imperial and colonial agendas, the elevated social position of athletes and the disciplinary pedagogy of the playing fields in lethal violence school stories also endorse characters' identity formation to include particular characteristics—in this case aggression, competition, self-interest, and individualism that benefits neoliberalism's capitalist values. Athletes, or the more frequently hailed "jocks," are routinely situated at the top of the social hierarchy, and their top positions are maintained and validated through the habitual spectacle of bullying social outcasts. Bullied students are subjugated by the habitual violence which confirms their place as "losers" or "outcasts" in their having invited the violence through their nonconformity. Authors present this repeated social structure as laying the foundation for lethal school violence. Neoliberal capitalist structures are naturalized by the microcosm of the school space in which bullying and competition are rewarded with status and (adult) protection from any negative consequences tied to their behaviours. Rather than the propagated nonviolent social contract governing student bodies'

interactions in school spaces, victims are socialized and educated by their schools' symbolic power structures that the only means of escaping victimization and "fitting in" in their school, and in adult society, is to become either victimizers themselves, passive bystanders propping up victimizers, or to exit the system which oppresses them.

Strasser's *Give a Boy a Gun* (2000) depicts a school space controlled and ordered by the jock/winner/victimizer and outcast/loser/victim hierarchy described above. The novel is told through interviews with the families, friends, girlfriends, classmates, and teachers of Brendan and Gary, two teenagers who bring guns to a school dance with which they wound several students and teachers. Strasser interweaves fact with fiction with the insertion of statistics, newspaper articles, internet postings, and police reports all relating to Columbine and gun violence more generally in America to present "a broader tale of what is happening all around our country—in a world of schools and guns and violence" ("Introduction"). Strasser's insertions of non-fictional artefacts insist upon the realism and immediacy of the fictional narrative's subject matter. Further blurring fiction and non-fiction, the novel takes place in a reality in which the Columbine rampage shooting is common knowledge, and Brendan and Gary idealize the Columbine shooters, Harris and Klebold.

The disciplinary school space in Strasser's novel is firmly governed by the winners' victimization of those perceived as losers by the competitive neoliberal hegemonic values that inform the space. There is a multifaceted and escalating ladder of subgroups, and the male jocks, and the girls who date them, occupy the top of the social scale.[53] Emily Kirsch, a friend of Gary

[53] How the school is socially organized changes from text to text, but each has a complicated organizational caste system of groups and subgroups. To illustrate the detailed breakdown of subgroups depicted, consider Jim Shepard's school space in *Project X* (2004): "Everybody's in a group. Everybody spends all their time thinking about their group. Or how they want to be in a different group. . . . On top are the jocks, though not all jocks" (chp. 2). The space is organized in

and Brendan, explains the "whole jock and cheerleader and designer name thing just got stronger and stronger. They were like the Sun, and the rest of us were all these little planets stuck in orbit around them" (Strasser "Eighth Grade"), and that this structure of the school feels as if "it was their [jocks' and cheerleaders'] world. And somehow you hadn't been picked to be part of it" (Strasser "Ninth Grade"). Male jocks and female cheerleaders claim the top social position, and this characterizes the space as claimed and ordered by students whose gendered and sexual identities align with hegemonic values. The type of social hierarchy that is ubiquitous in YA lethal violence texts is succinctly defined in Netflix's teen drama *13 Reasons Why* (adapted from Jay Asher's 2007 YA novel of the same name), when one character clarifies that

> [J]ocks walk down the halls like they own the place. The teachers feed into it. . . . You try going to school with a bunch of Neanderthals who are told that they are the only thing of value in the school, and the rest of us are merely there to cheer them on and provide them with support. ("Tape 7, Side A").

One group is perceived as the most valuable asset produced by the school space, and the rest of the student bodies are present simply to act as the "losers" to provide "winners" their success.

---

descending order as follows: jocks, Buffys (kids who look like they came off the TV), school-spirit types, band kids, jocks in the "wrong" sports, artsy kids, kids who are good at something, theatre kids, rebels, druggies, kids nobody notices, the fuckups, the geeks, kids from the sticks, the "kids with missing jaws and shit" (chp. 2), and lastly the two shooters: "us, our group is a group of two" (chp. 2). *Project X* is indicative of other texts examined in that even the group of athletes is highly organized. Football players are regarded at the top of the ladder, whereas "if you do cross-country, you might as well be on the chess team" (chp. 2). In the film *Mean Girls* (2004), the protagonist is literally given a map of the cafeteria on her first day of school. Each table is labelled with which subgroups habitually eat there; as one student explains, "[W]here you sit in the cafeteria is critical because you've got everybody there: you've got your freshman, ROTC guys, preps, J.V. jocks, Asian nerds, cool Asians, varsity jocks, unfriendly black hotties, girls who eat their feelings, girls who don't eat anything, desperate wannabes, burnouts, sexually active band geeks . . . and the plastics" (*Mean Girls*).

The symbolic power structures of the school space are informed, answerable, and accountable to the surrounding neoliberal society. Rather than adults restricting the arbitrary use of authority in the school space to guarantee justice to those mistreated, the bullying behaviours of athletes are either ignored by teachers or naturalized as a universal coming-of-age ritual that prepares students for the capitalist structures of adult society, thus freeing adults from the responsibility of intervening. In Strasser's novel, teachers are blamed by students for condoning and ignoring the behaviours of the athlete victimizers. From the teachers' perspectives, they are accountable to the society encompassing the school—schoolboards, parents, university recruiters, future employers—and feel obligated to protect the school's prize possession: its athletes. As the school counsellor, Beth, explains, "There is an unwritten law here about the treatment of athletes, especially athletes on the teams that have a chance to go to the playoffs and bring the school recognition and enhance its pride," and it would have to be "an absolutely extraordinary situation for you to do anything that would impinge on that athlete's ability to play for his team" (Strasser "More of Ninth Grade").[54] Bullying is part of the everyday atmosphere of the school, and the athletes' victimization of social outcasts does not qualify as an extraordinary circumstance that merits interference. Beth explains that the "unwritten law" of the athletes' treatment is created by dominant society in that if she, or any other teacher, holds an athlete accountable for his conduct it would "invite the worst kind of scorn . . . from the administration, other teachers, and the town at large" (Strasser "More of Ninth Grade"). Beth communicates the

[54] In Nancy Garden's *Endgame* (2006), protagonist Gray is frustrated by the special treatment of the victimizers by teachers. Though there are "fancy policies against fighting," they are not applied to "jocks" (101). Those on varsity teams "didn't have to go by the same rules as the rest of us and . . . they had special privileges, even days off around the time of big games" (101). This echoes Gordon's realization in Waugh's *Loom of Youth* that for those on teams "laws ceased to exist" (9).

potential risk that comes from "disturbing the universe" for teachers, and that it is a risk many will not take.

Teachers' hesitation to intervene is further explored in Strasser's novel by Principal Allen Curry's frank explanation of how he views the purpose and symbolic power structures of his school:

> Running a school is like *running a business*. I know this may sound crass, but you're *producing a product*. In our case, *that product is a high school senior* who is prepared to go on in the world and be successful in the community. So, in a way, you can say that we have to produce a product that the community approves of, that they will buy into. Sure, I would love to be Edward James Olmos in *Stand and Deliver* and produce a bunch of kids who value calculus over athletics, but if that's not what the community wants, I'll be out of a job. ("Tenth Grade", emphasis added)

Like Beth, Curry is cognizant of the risks in disturbing the disciplinary social structures of the school, and rather than unsettle his job security, Curry chooses to maintain the assembly-line policy in place that produces subjects who will perform dominant society's conception of acceptable racial (white), gendered (cis), and sexual (straight) identities. Curry believes himself to be answerable to hegemonic society, not his individual students. Because the surrounding community values character traits that are assumed to be fostered by athletics, Curry discriminates with his authority by protecting the jocks from punishments for their violent behaviours. Curry believes himself answerable to one particular type of student, the product the culturally dominant neoliberal society values, and this destroys any pretence of the school space being a democratic institution that treats students the same regardless of their race, gender, mobility, sexual orientation, culture, and economic position.

Adults in the texts further, and uniformly, recuse themselves from the responsibility of interfering in youth relationships by naturalizing bullying and school violence. In Jodi Picoult's *Nineteen Minutes* (2007), the school's gym teacher is questioned during the legal proceedings that follow a rampage school shooting regarding whether he ever witnessed students bullying each other during class, and if so, did he intercede? The teacher answers, "I probably told the kids to knock it off. But's its part of growing up, right?" (379). The teacher exhibits a dismissive attitude towards bullying in his perception of the practice as a normal part of the maturation process. A similar sentiment is expressed in Strasser's *Get a Boy a Gun*: a popular student, Deirdre Bunson, defends the bullying that takes place at her school by quoting her mother, who testifies, "It was just like this when they [her mother] went to school," causing Deirdre to draw the conclusion that "[i]t must be like this at every other high school. . . . [T]hat's the way it's always been. I mean, isn't part of growing up just learning to deal with it?" (Strasser "Ninth Grade"). Deirdre excuses the victimizing behaviour of herself and others by creating a narrative that bullying is a legacy of youth which naturalizes and imbues bullying as an invaluable socialization process linked with maturity. Following Deirdre's faulty logic, she provides marginalized students a valuable education, and perpetrators of lethal violence demonstrate their immaturity in being unable to "deal with it."

When adults in these texts, most often teachers, are petitioned for help, the victimized do not encounter allies ready to defend them, but they are offered disinterested advice that furthers the naturalization of bullying and the lofty positions of the athlete bullies. In Walter Dean Myers's *Shooter* (2004), Cameron, the best friend of the shooter, reports pleading with his principal for help in gaining reprieve from bullies, but the principal "said, more or less, that dealing with teenagers was part of the growing up process, it was something I had to learn how

to do" (Myers). Again, an adult in a place of authority validates habitual school violence in the form of bullying as an acceptable method of socialization and education. In these narratives, bullying is represented as authorized as an acceptable method of socialization by those who govern the space, which in turn structures the school as an oppressive space that suppresses certain students for their nonconformity.

In some instances, when asked for help, adults respond by petitioning the victims of bullying to consider how they are complicit in *allowing* themselves to be bullied; here, public issues are blatantly reduced to problems of the individual. In Nancy Garden's *Endgame*, Gray receives the advice from his father that he must not "give anyone any reason to bully you" (206), and this places the blame on the victim of bullying for being victimized. Gray is figured at fault by his father because of his sustained nonconformity instead of adopting a more accepted identity performance. Similarly, in the Netflix drama *13 Reasons Why,* Tyler reports his being "pantsed" to the school counsellor. The counsellor first belittles the incident— "the school I transferred from, kids shot kids. Pants, I don't know" ("Tape 3, Side A")—and he then attempts to solve Tyler's problem by having him consider two things: "What is it that *you* can do to protect yourself? What is anything that *you're* doing that might provoke kids?" ("Tape 3, Side A", emphasis added). Tyler replies frustratingly, "You're serious? That's convenient. Blame the victim" ("Tape 3, Side A"). The school counsellor makes Tyler complicit in his own victimization by positioning his nonconformity as what "provokes" the attacks, and that he is failing to protect himself by not altering his identity performance. Tyler is shown stockpiling guns and ammunition in the first season's finale, gesturing that he too may choose the "exit" option.

In all cases, the victims are chastised by adults in places of authority for "allowing" themselves to be bullied and failing to pass the socialization lessons the youth subgroups of the school are meant to absorb. If it is true that the school social game is one that can be won, characters are made to feel like losers by the adults in charge in that it is *their* failure to "fit in" by performing the acceptable dominant neoliberal culture's gendered, racial, classed, and sexual identities that invites their experience of school violence. Going to the highest level of authority that governs the space and experiencing rejection lays the groundwork for these students to choose to exit the system that excludes them, and that will continue to exclude them in the macrocosm that has informed the microcosm of the school.

The Spaces and Bodies Marked for Violence

For outcast characters, moving around the school space is like navigating a mine field: some spaces are more dangerous than others. In YA lethal violence school stories, the playing fields, gymnasiums, and locker rooms are the key and frequent hubs where the bullying of the outcasts/losers by jocks/winners takes place. These architectural spaces celebrate and foster athleticism and function as fields of comparison for the homogenous student-body to measure and compare bodies and behaviours of individuals. The most common performance judged in these physical spaces is one's heteronormative gendered and sexual identities, which are arbitrarily tied to athletic ability. Individuals found wanting by the surveying student body are punished though spectacles of public bullying in spaces of comparison, which define the boundaries and limits of acceptable difference to the witnesses of the punishment.

These contentious spaces have not been chosen randomly by authors but reflect the lived experience of many youth in schools. In their study of homophobia and transphobia in Canadian

schools, Rebecca Haskell and Brain Burtch found that physical education (P.E.) classes were a "locus" of bullying and that "physical education takes on a new meaning as physical forms of violence teach students about the importance of mainstream gender norms" (36). Through interviews with LGBTQ students attending Canadian high schools, Haskell and Burtch found that locker rooms are an especially charged location for symbolic and literal violence because of the lack of faculty presence. The youth interviewed "dread" P.E. largely because of the class being bookended by time in the locker rooms, a space where they "felt unsafe, or at least uncomfortable, sites where bodied were barred, unprotected and open to scrutiny" (38). Haskell and Burtch argue, "Gender-segregated spaces [locker rooms] increase demands for adherence to gender norms and require one to prove that they belong there" (38), and bodies are closely scrutinized to determine their belonging. If one's gendered performance during P.E. is unsatisfactory, the individual's body can become a site of close inspection in the locker rooms.

Stephen King's novel *Carrie* (1974), and the two film adaptations by Brian De Palma (1976) and Kimberley Peirce (2013), present the space of the locker room as the most momentous site of bullying that is initiated by Carrie's failure to prove she belongs by her performing poorly in P.E.[55] Carrie comes from a lower-class, poor, single-parent family, and her class position separates her from her peers and informs her interactions with them. In De Palma's film, Carrie physically inhabits the margins as she stands at a distance from her peers during a game of volleyball. The gym teacher forces her to participate in the game, and Carrie fails horribly at serving the volleyball, further marking her as "othered" from the whole class, who are able to effortlessly volley the ball back and forth. Peirce's adaptation has the P.E. class playing

[55] While not intended as a YA story when initially written and published, *Carrie* has become a significant text in the YA canon made evident with the 2013 film adaptation being marketed as a teen horror movie.

water volleyball, placing Carrie in an even more vulnerable position in having to wear a swimsuit. Once again separated from the group, Carrie hides in the corner of the pool and is discernibly uncomfortable, indicated through her awkwardly hugging her body in an attempt to hide her breasts and stomach. In both adaptations, Carrie's failure is two-fold: she does not participate in the game successfully (loser) and she does not perform her gendered identity to the same standards as the group (outcast).

Following her failures in gym class, Carrie is further marked an outcast in the locker room. In the showers, Carrie is shocked to see her first menstrual blood, and, believing she is dying, screams for help. Rather than help or explain to Carrie what is happening, her peers taunt and punish her lack of knowledge and behaviour by throwing sanitary napkins and tampons at Carrie while repeatedly chanting: "Plug it up!" (King). The scene in all three representations functions as a symbolic stoning. The gym class transforms into a taunting mob, and the feminine hygiene products into stones that result in Carrie's social death. Pierce's adaptation raises and updates the stakes in having the punishment recorded with a smartphone and uploaded to YouTube for the entire student body to witness—it is a spectacle where the many observe the punishment of an individual. The video goes viral within the school, and the spectacle transcends the moment by extending and expanding Carrie's humiliation with each new view.

King argues that his school space in *Carrie* presents high school as "a place of almost bottomless conservatism and bigotry, a place where the adolescents who attend are no more allowed to rise 'above their station' than a Hindu would be allowed to rise above his or her caste" (*Danse* 180). King speaks to the "lie" of the "American Dream" (anyone can accomplish anything with hard work) as Carrie's class position marks her as an outcast in her school space and limits her possibility for success in the space. There is no opportunity for Carrie's upward

mobility, and this impossibility is accentuated during prom. Chris, the female leader of the bullying campaign, organizes a gruesome re-enactment of Carrie's shower embarrassment by pouring pig's blood on Carrie following her being crowned prom queen. Adding more cruelty to the event, Chris manipulates the prom king and queen election to ensure Carrie wins. Carrie experiences a brief moment of being an accepted "winner" only to have it revealed a prank intended to demean, further situate her in the margins, and demonstrate the impossibility of her upward mobility.

The laughter of her peers at her expense is Carrie's breaking point, and she chooses to violently exit the oppressive system. Using her psychic powers—this is, of course, a Stephen King novel—she engulfs the school gym in flames and kills everyone inside. Dubbed the "Black Prom," Carrie murders 440 of her peers and neighbours, and she herself dies as a result of expelling all her energy in the rampage, aligning Carrie with other lethal violence protagonists who choose the exit option. King muses that *Carrie*'s commercial success, in both novel and film forms, "lies in this: Carrie's revenge is something that any student who ever had his gym shorts pulled down . . . could approve of. In Carrie's destruction of the gym . . . we see a dream revolution of the socially downtrodden" (*Danse* 183). Although the revolution has a supernatural source, King considers Carrie's exit to be a wish fulfilment for readers and viewers who share her life in the margins.

In Pierce's film adaption, the film ends with a trial that delivers an explicit moral for its youth audience. The lone survivor, Sue, who had also participated in the symbolic shower stoning, addresses the courtroom:

> You want an explanation? Carrie had some sort of power, and she was just like me. Like any of you. She had hopes, and she had fears, and we pushed her. And you can only push someone so far before they break. (Pierce)

Regardless of Carrie's psychic powers, Sue imbues a universality to Carrie's experience. In claiming that Carrie was like "any of you," Sue invokes the empathy of listeners, both those in the courtroom and viewers of the film, to see themselves in Carrie, in her mistreatment, and in her violence. Through Sue's charging the "we" who pushed Carrie, listeners are also implicated in her suffering. Sue's speech is reminiscent of King's own reflections on his protagonist, in which he considers Carrie to be "an example of the sort of person whose spirit is so often broken for good in that pit of man-and woman-eaters that is your normal suburban high school" (*Danse* 180-1). Youth reviews of Pierce's adaption reveal that King's original moral message, and reiterated by Sue in Pierce's film, has been clearly received. On the site *Common Sense Media*, thirteen-year-old reviewer Freya finds "positive messages" in the film including "Do not bully people . . . and do not set fire to schools with super powers" (Freya). Thirteen-year-old ReaganJones believes the film to be a classic because it "shows how much of a[n] effect bullying is [sic] on kids mentally" (ReaganJones), and thirteen-year-old tac0906 found it a "good movie" for its "message saying stop bullying" (tac0906). These youth reviewers demonstrate the film as successful in inviting the empathic involvement of viewers which, in turn, implicates them in their own treatment of others.

Bullying and school violence is disparaged, but it is again normalized as a commonplace teen behaviour. In writing about *Carrie*, King emphasizes it is indicative of a common high school, and thus a youth, experience. There is no consideration in the novel, or the writing around it, how the larger (adult) socio-cultural context informs such spaces. For example, no

consideration is given to the systemic forces that have trapped Carrie and her mother in their social position such as Carrie's mother's untreated mental illness, the stigmas attached to mental illness, and the difficulties of accessing and affording medical treatment for such illnesses. Instead, Carrie's peers are solely blamed for the school violence, and implied readers and viewers are warned they too could be implicated if they do not treat others with respect. Treating everyone with dignity and respect is a valuable goal for children, youth, and adults alike, but it sidesteps the systemic issues that inform school spaces.

Gus Van Sant's film *Elephant* (2003), which is closely based on the Columbine massacre, also depicts the dangers of the playing fields and locker rooms.[56] In the film, Michelle is first shown running an outdoor track wearing sweatpants and a sweatshirt, both which bear insignia of the high school. She keeps pace with her classmates, and even appears to enjoy running as a smile can be apprehended on her face. Unlike Carrie, Michelle performs athletically, but the scrutinizing gaze of the gym teacher finds Michelle's clothes to be unacceptably deviant. As the class walks to the locker room, Michelle is singled out by the teacher for her gym wear:

> "We've got to talk about this gym clothes problem. . . . [T]hese long pants, everyone else is wearing shorts. . . . I don't want to give a mark against you, but I'm going to have to if you don't show up in shorts like you're supposed to. . . . Tomorrow I want to see those shorts!" (Van Sant)

[56] Van Sant's film is significant in that it was the first film to portray the events of Columbine, and in its use of youth actors in all performances, many whom were unprofessional actors. Much of the film's sparse dialogue is adlibbed by the youth actors, some characters' stories are based on the actors themselves, and some characters share the name of the actors portraying them. These elements strongly blur the line between fact and fiction and show Van Sant's attempt to include authentic youth voices and experiences in his film.

The gym teacher displays no compassion or attempt to understand why Michelle may not want to wear the shorts. The male students in the film's background wear pants or shorts that fall to their knees, which shows the dress code is an arbitrary rule that maintains a limited and constrained type of gendered performance. Giroux finds the harsh punishments for violating school dress codes as indicative of the "war culture" that pervades North American society that extends to the "ongoing . . . criminalization of everyday behaviour" in schools ("Killing Children"). Michelle is not criminalized, but her teacher ignores Michelle's athletic performance, and threatens to discipline her nonconformity by deducting marks. The reprimand directly relates Michelle's ability to succeed as being dependent on her performing an acceptable normative feminine identity.

In the locker room, Michelle's peers continue the task of disciplining Michelle for her inadequate feminine performance through taunts and isolation. Michelle forgoes a shower, presumably because she is uncomfortable being naked in the enclosed, yet public, space, and expertly transitions from her track suit into school clothes while keeping her body covered. Inaudible group chatter initially accompanies Michelle's changing, but slowly a few distinct voices become audible that maliciously gossip about Michelle: "That nerd girl . . . oh yea, her right there . . . granny panties . . . she does smell" (Van Sant). Michelle, hearing these insults, rushes from the room when dressed, and one girl shouts "Loser!" as she leaves (Van Sant). Though Michelle performed well athletically, she fails in the space of the gym and locker room in her inability to conform to others' expectations.

Male characters similarly struggle in P.E. class and the locker rooms. In Garden's *Endgame*, Gray (the shooter) and Ross are first made objects of the jocks' scorn when they witness Gray and Ross's struggle to pass a football during gym class. Immediately the jocks call

into question Gray's and Ross's masculinity in labelling them "girls" (47, 48), and "faggots" (48), using sexism, misogyny, and homophobia as tools of enforcement. Following the "discovery" of Gray and Ross, the jocks become obsessive in their physical and verbal abuse. The jocks' constant bullying punishes Gray and Ross for their inability to adhere to arbitrary gender norms, marks Gray and Ross as low in the social caste system because of their deviance and affirms the jocks' normative masculinity and position atop the social caste system. While the bullying of Gray and Ross happens throughout the school, the most insidious incidents, notably, take place in the locker room. The first occurs when Gray and Ross linger in the locker room after gym to solve a math problem before class, and the jocks stumble upon them. Gray and Ross are labelled "trespassers" because the locker room "belongs to us [senior jocks]" (68). The jocks accuse the freshman of not showing "respect" for the space or the jocks' authority over it by staying longer than deemed appropriate (69). Demanding they "look up to varsity" (69), the jocks intimidate Gray and Ross by repeatedly pushing their heads against lockers while chanting, "Varsity rules!" (69, 70). Through this bullying, the jocks attempt to instil fear in Ross and Gray to discipline them into docile and subservient bodies, as well as validate their own power over the space, which is reminiscent of fourth-, fifth-, and sixth-formers in public-school stories

In the pivotal bullying event, the jocks walk in on Gray and Ross showering after gym class. The jocks physically restrain both naked boys and forcefully push Gray's head into Ross's groin while taunting, "Suck his dick!" (259). The event is a breaking point for Ross: when freed of the bullies' grasp, he turns his aggression towards Gray and becomes a victimizer, the only form of power the jocks' disciplinary practices and adult society has taught him will work. Ross repeatedly strikes Gray, who refuses to fight back and remains firmly in the position of victim. The jocks encircle them, but take Ross into their fold, showing their acceptance of his

aggression, by shouting at Gray, “Crater Face, Pee Wee Pecker, Pee Wee Prick, Pee Wee Dick, fag, fag, fag” (260). Gray’s refusal to be aggressive shows he holds onto the nonviolent resolution contract, and this brings him shame in that practising the ideal social code that the school space claims to be ruled by results in his being further punished and humiliated. Recounting the incident to his lawyer (Gray is disarmed before he can harm himself), Gray explains that in the moment he “hated my worthless, stupid self” (261), demonstrating that the disciplinary practices of the jocks have succeeded. Gray comes to believe that he is less valuable than the jocks. The next day, Gray chooses to opt out of participation in the ideal nonviolent system that the elite students do not have to abide by, and he renounces nonviolence by bringing a gun to school and killing six people, including Ross and the head jock, Zorro. Gray has been socialized and educated by his school experience that the only way to stop being a loser/victim is to victimize others, and that being a winner must entail someone else losing: “I feel great and strong and free like *I’ve won after all*” (266, emphasis added). Gray comes to believe nonviolence is an ideal impossible to uphold in his school space and thus opts out of participation by joining instead in the violence of the elite.

The homophobia in *Endgame*, and its occurrence on the playing fields and in the locker rooms, is emblematic of all YA lethal violence school stories. With the exception of *Carrie*, all perpetrators of lethal school violence in the subset are young men whose masculinity and sexuality are daily scrutinized and found unsatisfactory. Unable to perform a heteronormative masculine identity to the standards of athletes, these young men are targeted for daily violence, which often takes the form of homophobic slurs, or violence such as in *Endgame*. Regardless of their sexuality, across all YA lethal violence school stories, young men with deviant gendered performances are accused of homosexuality with the intention of shaming and belittling them. In

Myer's *Shooter*, Cameron explains that off-handed slurs like "Hey fag give me a dollar" have a loaded meaning and intention: "What they're really saying is that you're nothing. . . . [T]hen when they say that, they look at you and wait for your answer. And when you put your head down and walk away . . . then you're saying the same thing, that you're nothing" (Myers). According to Cameron, the casual cruelty of derogatory slurs function as a disciplinary tactic, or even a challenge to the victim/loser. The victimizer asserts his power and authority over the victim, not only in demanding something ("give me a dollar"), but also in calling the victim a "fag." The slur labels the victim as falling short of the acceptable gender norms and thus deserving of discrimination. In not challenging this act of discipline and assertion of authority, Cameron argues that one accepts one's own failure and concedes to the society of spectacle's and symbolic power structure's assertions that he is worthless.

The athletic spaces of comparison maintain and validate the social caste system of the school spaces in YA lethal violence texts. Authors spend significant time describing violent bullying behaviours of the jocks and spaces which foster aggression to establish the oppressive nature of the school space for those who do not, or cannot not, live up to the hegemonic standards endorsed by symbolic power structures. Detailing the oppressiveness of the system for those low on the social scale does the work of fostering empathy for victimized characters before their acts of lethal violence. Readers are encouraged to empathize with the victimized, to see themselves reflected in the victims and victimizers, to build an understanding of why an individual might chose to exit the oppressive system. It does not excuse violent exits but fosters an understanding of why one might be drawn to the choice. The authors' next step, detailing violent exits, presents a dystopic warning to readers regarding the high stakes attached to

transforming their own treatment of others as imperative to reforming school environments, and rests the blame for sustained school violence firmly on implied readers' shoulders.

The Violence and Politics of Exiting the School Space

Characters who choose to exit the oppressive disciplinary school space usually experience a climactic violent incident, a breaking point, making them desperate to escape their situation and social place. Clive Harber, in his examination of school shootings, finds the pressure to obey authority in school settings—in this case, the authority of the winners/victimizers—reproduces group loyalties and hostilities of surrounding society as well as "the active encouragement and deepening of them" (86). In creating a setting that has "low levels of concern for social justice" and few ways to deal with "dissent or difference" the "individuals or groups who reject what is happening to them may well resort to physical violence because there is no other way to respond or because they have learned that this is the normal way to behave and respond" (Harber 43-4). Harber describes what Aronowitz and Webber label as the exit option, in which one determines there is no end to his or her current state of existence, even upon graduation, because schools reproduce social structures of adult society, and thus he or she decides to exit society through violent means. Believing they have been rejected by systems of power, a belief reinforced by peers' treatment of them, characters who perpetuate lethal violence do so as the means of rejecting and rebelling against the systems of power which have already rejected them. Webber argues that the violence against others and the school space preceding their exit should not be considered revenge against other people, but "revenge against a particular form of existence" (117). Lethal school violence, as represented in this subset of school stories, is a political statement against the oppressive nature of school spaces, or, as Larkin argues, "a means of

protest of bullying, intimidation, social isolation, and public rituals of humiliation" ("Legacy" 1309).

Most characters plan to exit the system through suicide, but, significantly, plot to exit only after briefly disturbing the schools' symbolic power structures through violence against their peers and damaging the architectural school space. The need for revenge is validated by the neoliberal adult society and culture within which the schools exist because revenge is another form of individualized domination, and thus provides a momentary opportunity for the characters to succeed within their society. Most of these characters are "successful" in their exits, with a smaller number disarmed before they can take their own lives. The power of lethal violence to disturb and disrupt the social caste structure and their place within it is verbalized in Lionel Shriver's *We Need to Talk About Kevin* (2003), in which Kevin's mother reasons that her son's act of violence was an attempt to escape the labels of the school space: "He doesn't have to worry about whether he's a freak or a geek, a grind or a jock or a nerd. He doesn't have to worry if he's gay. He's a murderer. It's marvelously unambiguous" (164-5). Though *Kevin* is not a YA novel, the sentiment of a marvellous unambiguity of "murderer" is highly desired in the YA lethal violence texts as it provides an exit and way to transcend the oppressive social hierarchy of the school space. Being a "murderer" becomes the sole defining and lasting characterization of the characters, in which their power, even if only held during the incident, is unquestionable prior to exiting the system which oppressed them.

Characters target specific spaces within the school to act as the locus for their violence: gymnasiums, cafeterias, gathering spaces, and auditoriums. These locations hold large numbers of people and are enclosed sites where daily inclusion and exclusion rituals are practised, making them ideal locations to symbolically and literally destroy school structures. The cafeteria is a

space where subcultures are physically ordered, as strict rules govern who is permitted to sit at certain tables. Many of the perpetrators are not allowed space in the cafeteria or are permitted tables on the periphery and made to watch from the outskirts the social systems with which they have been excluded. If attempts are made to border-cross to other tables, the perpetrators often experience ritualistic punishments; for example, in *Nineteen Minutes*, Nick approaches the popular students' table and is rewarded with having his pants and boxers pulled down by one of the occupants, leaving Nick humiliated, vulnerable, and exposed as the entire cafeteria fills with laughter (Picoult 321).

The school gymnasium, along with being the location in which daily gendered performances are measured and bodies are closely scrutinized, is also the location for school assemblies and dances. Assemblies are often propaganda events for sports teams, linking "school spirit" and "school pride" with the athletes, further alienating outcasts in the events praising their victimizers. As in the cafeteria, only winners fit and perform comfortably within the space of the gymnasium because of their expert performance of heteronormative rituals. At dances, outcast characters either do not attend, knowing they will be excluded, or if they attend are punished for being unable to perform the heteronormative romantic practices to the same level as the winners (for example, as Carrie is). These spaces represent the oppressive social system the perpetrators want to destroy and from which they choose to "exit."

In *This Is Where It Ends*, Tyler enacts his shooting rampage in the school auditorium, a space he avoided previously because "he thought the auditorium was a prison" (179). The majority of the school gathers in the auditorium during the first day of the winter semester to hear the principal deliver her standard opening address, which is reminiscent of the headmasters' and headmistresses' speeches in Golden Age school stories meant to instil loyalty to school and

country. Tyler times his violence to begin directly following the principal's speech, casting a sinister and dark hue over her motivational address:

> [I]t's all a matter of the decisions you make, today and every day. Your behavior reflects not only on yourself but also on your parents, your family, and your school. Here at Opportunity, we pride ourselves on shaping the doctors, lawyers, and politicians of tomorrow. And it's the choices you make now that will determine your future. You have to ask yourself how you can become the best you can be. Ask not what your school can do for you but what *you* can do for you. (4-5)

With this clichéd address, the school being named Opportunity, and its motto "*We Shape the Future*" (2), the school is typical in promising ideal citizens upon graduation as a result of the character and moral formation the school will provide. The address takes on dark implications in light of Tyler's lethal violence: his actions reflect on his family and school (media outlets quickly flock to the scene and begin mining Tyler's past and present relationships and influences to tag a motivation onto their headlines), is shaped by his experiences at Opportunity (he is violently bullied, often because of his own bigotry), and determines his future nonparticipation in the systems he finds oppressive in his choice to exit the system with his suicide. For Tyler, his violent exit is the "best he can be" in exacting revenge on the system of existence which he believes oppressed him.

Tyler begins his violence seconds after the principal concludes her address, highlighting the dark inversion Tyler's actions have on her sentiments. Directly following the speech, Tyler shoots and instantly kills the principal, destroying the figure of authority who had failed him (according to Tyler), and replaces her with himself as the sole figure of power and authority in the space. Tyler transforms the space that had once been like a prison to him into "his

battleground" (68), a "shooting range" (140), and "a morgue" (140). Most of the victims are chosen at random, as Tyler's actions align with Webber's arguments that perpetrators of school lethal violence are seeking revenge from a condition of existence, not a specific person. Those Tyler does single out, like the principal, are symbols for the structures Tyler believes to have oppressed him. Throughout his reign of terror, Tyler orders his former classmates to raise their hands and shoots those who do not, he targets and kills an "out-and-proud" student, and he shoots a boy for whom Tyler's ex-girlfriend dumped him. Those specifically targeted are considered by Tyler to have contributed to his oppressive existence, as he once raged: "This school is taking everything away from me" (99). In directly targeting those who "do not fit into his perfect world" (96), Tyler has accepted the normalization of violent social structures and is motivated by racist, sexiest, and homophobic prejudices in his reordering of the school. Tyler transforms the space into a site ordered and structured by violence in which he acts as the authority figure capable of, if even for a short period of time, slightly reordering the social caste system to how he believes it should be structured: himself at the top, and all those with behaviours he considers deviant at the bottom. The title of the novel, *This Is Where It Ends*, can be attributed to Tyler's act of violence being an attempt to end the social systems he so hates because of his belief that they have persecuted him.

All the texts, in varying degrees and levels of directness, express the hope that social relationships in the represented school spaces will be reformed following the lethal violence. Many of the novels' didacticism reinforces a simplistic and problematic argument that bullying is only a youth problem that can be solved simply by fostering individual empathy. The appeal to implied readers' empathy ultimately reinforces victim blaming instead of critiquing the bigger

and more complex connections between the social and cultural norms of the schools and that of adult society such as capitalism, corporate culture, class, gun culture and so on.

One approach is to follow events leading up to lethal violence linearly and end the narratives directly following or shortly after the event (*Endgame*, *Lockdown*, *Elephant*, *Project X*). Reviews of these narratives often express frustration in there not being "closure." In a *Publisher's Weekly* review of *Endgame*, the reviewer argues that "plenty of readers will keep going to find an ending more tragic than expected. No one learns anything" ("Endgame"). The review most likely stems from the novel's "Epilogue" in which Gray receives his sentencing. Gray is unable to show remorse for what he has done, believing it is "Zorro's fault" that Gray was "teased. Brutalized . . . Misunderstood. Yea. So I showed them" (276, 283). The novel closes with Gray showing no regret for what he has done, nor does anyone express any understanding or empathy for the victimization which pushed him to extreme violence.

Other YA lethal violence school stories offer a similarly linear plot leading up to the lethal violence but linger in the school space briefly to provide an indication of the impact on the victims, survivors, and "exiters"/perpetrators (*This Is Where It Ends,* Pignat's *Shooter*). In *This Is Where It Ends,* during a vigil on school grounds the night of the shooting, a student tells the group gathered, "We are not better because we survived. We are not brighter or more deserving. We are not stronger. But we are here. We are here, and this day will never leave us" (280). The group is united in having shared the devastating experience, and positive changes are made with little emotional and intellectual work on the part of the characters, without behaviour (for example, bullying) needing to change, and without any political reforms (for example, reformed gun laws). The social structure of the school space is transformed by the initial shock and grief of

the lethal violence, and this group conveys the simplistic notion that only peer relationships need to be different in order for the school space to be reformed.

A third category of texts does not follow a linear timeline, but moves around temporally to before, during, and after lethal violence, simultaneously showing what led up to the violent acts and the consequences of them (*Nineteen Minutes*, *Give a Boy a Gun*, Myer's *Shooter*, *Boo*, *The Hate List*). These texts offer more complex consequences that begin to challenge the notion that tragedy alone unites and changes behaviour. For example, *Give a Boy a Gun* and *Hate List* spend a great deal of time in the school space after their lethal violence events. The school communities are not transformed into harmonious groups but are governed by the same social hierarchies that reigned prior to violent events, with the ruling class continuing their victimizing behaviours. Many of the protagonists in this group of texts express frustration that even when confronted by the extreme violence, victimizers continue to victimize those marginalized in the school's social structure. In *Hate List*, the protagonist, Val, returns to school following a lethal event, hoping the school environment has changed: "'Have things changed much?' I asked. 'I mean, are people different now?' I didn't know what I hoped her answer would be. Yes, everyone learned their lesson and now we're all one big, happy family" (47). But Val soon witnesses her school as a whole remains largely unchanged, as the old "rivalries" still rule the school. What the narrative does not make explicit is why the old rivalries remain: the surrounding adult society that rewards competitive and aggressive peer relationships has not been changed by school violence, and thus the macrocosm continues to produce a microcosm that endorses the values of neoliberalism.

It is on an individual level that Brown depicts reformation in her characters. Jessica, a popular girl who tormented Val prior to the shooting, changes her behaviour and is kind to Val,

including sitting with her at lunch and inviting her to work on the memorial for the shooting victims. Jessica understands that her victimizing behaviour contributed to the act of lethal violence and in facing her guilt is determined to make reparations to Val. Jessica faces possible exclusion from her popular peers for her kindness to Val, but continues to treat Val with the respect and dignity that was absent prior to the shooting. Brown shows the potential for change in the character of Jessica and likewise demonstrates the difficulty that can accompany doing so. Jessica's decision threatens to destabilize symbolic power structures and replaces bullying with kindness, which undercuts the power source she once had in the space. Jessica is able to empathize with Val and the shooter, she takes responsibility for her role in sustaining an oppressive school environment, and she seeks to reform the environment through her treatment of Val. Brown's novel, and the others in this category, model that work that is needed on an individual level for readers to transform their own schools into spaces governed by inclusive practices. Yet Brown and others stop short of politicizing their characters and this makes the systemic "causes of mass shootings . . . disappear" and builds instead a "culture of cruelty, silence and indifference to the needs of children" (Giroux "Killing Children").

Conclusion

YA lethal violence school stories are highly didactic novels that uniformly represent the social structure of school spaces as ordered by an oppressive victimizer/victim hierarchy. The social structure present in YA lethal violence school stories differs little from the school spaces that have been represented in school stories since their Golden Age, in which school spaces were also organized in a winners/victimizers versus losers/victimized social structure that mirrors the larger adult society. What differs in YA lethal violence school stories from others in the subgenre

is how victimized characters choose to "live actively" in the hegemonic space: to exit their oppressive school spaces through lethal violence towards their selves and peers. Many of the protagonists in the school stories examined in Chapters Two and Three rebelled, in various forms, against their hegemonically produced school spaces and resisted being made docile by their schools' nets of discipline. These prior rebellions were often subtle and "everyday" tactics that include reading subversive texts and being active agents in their education. Characters in YA lethal violence school stories also rebel against the oppressive structures of their schools, but with extreme methods that reproduce rather than significantly challenge the systems which oppressed them. Lethal violence is utilized to (briefly) reappropriate and reorder the characters' school spaces with the perpetrators simply putting themselves at the top of the hierarchy, all the while leaving the hierarchy that had oppressed them in place. The texts do not endorse this form of rebellion, but they use lethal school violence to explore the "homogenous social" of school spaces, how the social structures can contribute to a culture of cruelty, and how this culture can aggravate lethal school violence.

The surface ideologies of these texts shift responsibility to implied readers for accepting or reforming the social construction of their school spaces in how they will choose to treat their peers. This shift of responsibility alleviates blame from adult society and fails to consider the broader systemic forces that aggravate and contribute to lethal school violence. As was previously quoted from Netflix's *13 Reasons Why*, the texts ask implied readers, "What is it that you can do to protect yourself? What is anything that you're doing that might provoke kids?" ("Tape 3, Side A"). Readers are shown they can protect themselves simply by treating their peers with dignity and respect, and not provoke lethal school violence by bullying their peers. Once

again, the victims of violence are held the most responsible for the violence committed against them.

The texts *are* radical in their consideration of the ways schools' structures contribute to cultures of cruelty that aggravate lethal violence, but stop short of connecting these structures to the larger society that surrounds and informs school spaces. Access to firearms and reformed gun laws, the diagnosis, treatment, and stigma surrounding mental illness, understanding how violence and mental illness are aggravated by the social contexts (informed by neoliberalism) in which we live, better policies and procedures at the levels of school and law enforcement to detect, track, and treat individuals showing warning signs, are just a few parts of the complex web that needs to be untangled and addressed to truly put an end to lethal violence in school spaces. Instead, the novels offer simple solutions that do not encourage thoughtful political action or evaluation on the part of their readers.

Giroux is adamant that "[s]chools can no longer be viewed as zones of political, economic and social abandonment" ("Striking"), but that schools are "crucial to politics itself, and that any viable sense of theory, politics and resistance will have to address this issue" ("Conversations"). The youth authors in Chapter Two encourage implied readers to think critically about their own school spaces, and also rally readers to apply this same critical thought to the systemic structures that surround and inform their daily lives. The YA lethal violence school stories do not fully address how schools are crucial to politics, and the simplistic answers of students treating one another better does not do enough to address the symbiotic connection of schools to the socio-cultural macrocosm of which they are a part. As will be discussed in greater detail in Chapter Six and the Conclusion, the youth survivors of the 14 February 2018 Marjory Stoneman Douglas massacre in Parkland Florida have politicized themselves by actively seeking

reforms to gun laws, and are "[e]ngaged in a form of productive unsettling and collective dissent, they are fighting back, holding power accountable and giving birth to a vibrant form of political struggle" (Giroux, "Killing Children").

The following chapter delves into dystopian fiction, and similar to YA lethal violence school stories, these texts represent student characters who are oppressed by their school spaces, but the characters are able to rebel and eventually overthrow their schools. In spaces similarly structured to the YA lethal school stories, dystopian school stories present characters who *do* hold systemic power accountable, and they fight back against the political systems that order not only their school spaces, but the larger (adult) society.

Chapter Five

Inverting the Panopticon:

"Sousveillance" Tactics in YA Dystopian School Stories

> "[D]ystopian literature is just like high school: an oscillation between extremes of restraint."
>
> —Scott Westerfeld, "Teens and Dystopias"

Utopian and dystopian tropes have long been prominent in children's and YA literature, but in the new millennium YA dystopian fiction has dominated the book market. Lyman Town Sargent defines a dystopian text as a "social dreaming . . . the dreams and nightmares that concern the ways in which groups of people arrange their lives" (3), and which presents a "non-existent society . . . that the author intended a contemporary reader to view as considerably worse than the society in which that reader lived" (9). Dystopian texts can act as a warning to readers, "say[ing] if you behave thus so, this is how you will be punished," while also suggesting "that alternative modes of behavior are possible" (Sargent 8).[57] Dystopian tropes may mirror high school (as suggested in the epigraph to this chapter), but, significantly, YA dystopian fiction is rarely set in school spaces. If school spaces are included, they are a temporary set piece and

[57] Arguably, Suzanne Collins's *The Hunger Games* (2008) trilogy was the match that lit the fuse of the explosive popularity of YA dystopian fiction of the early 2000s. In 2012, Scholastic announced that *The Hunger Games* trilogy had more than 50 million print and digital copies and had surpassed the sale numbers of print and digital copies of J. K. Rowling's *Harry Potter* series on Amazon. In Collins's wake, dozens of similar tiles and series blossomed, some of the most popular being Scott Westerfeld's *Uglies* series (2005, 2006, 2007); Veronica Roth's *Divergent* trilogy (2011, 2012, 2013); James Dashner's *The Maze Runner* series (2009, 2010, 2011); Allyson Braithwaite's *Matched* trilogy (2010, 2011, 2012); and Marie Lu's *Legend* trilogy (2011, 2013).

rarely the most pivotal site of action. There are, however, a select set of rare exceptions that marry dystopian tropes with the school story: Orson Scott Card's *Ender's Game* (1985) and parallel novel *Ender's Shadow* (*1999*); S. J. Kincaid's *Insignia* trilogy (2012, 2013, 2014); and Joelle Charbonneau's *The Testing* trilogy (2013, 2014, 2015). Each author depicts a dystopian future and constructs restrictive and oppressive school spaces where adult power is exercised over young students through invasive surveillance technologies that are integrated into the school spaces.

Why YA dystopian texts have been so fervently consumed by youth has been much debated in popular media. Some critics belittle adolescents' experiences and struggles as not as "real" or as "important" as "adult" problems—a sentiment expressed in the lethal violence school stories regarding bullying and other forms of school violence by dismissing these behaviours as only a youth problem—and that YA dystopian literature exposes implied readers to the "bigger" issues of adult society. Cecelia Goodnow quips, "There's nothing like a hurtling asteroid to put teen angst in perspective" ("Profits of Doom"), and that exposure to "real" issues aids in youths' maturation process by putting their own struggles in perspective. Laura Miller, writing for *The New Yorker*, mirrors Goodnow's assumption that adolescents do not experience "real" problems and attributes the dangerous adventures of YA dystopian fiction as being attractive to "hovered-over teens" who are too coddled and thus crave danger ("Fresh Hell").

Julie Bertagna, author of the YA dystopian *Exodus* trilogy (2002-2011), argues exactly the opposite to Goodnow and Miller and finds it extraordinary that "a generation short on hope" and "fed on an everyday diet of terror" is drawn to dystopian texts ("Why Are Teenagers"). Bertagna reasons that youth readers must personally identify with the "ordinary rebels against a world gone wrong" ("Why Are Teenagers"). Book Sniffing Fangirl, a grade eleven student,

defends the value of YA dystopian literature in her book vlog (a video blog), and asserts that because they are "centered around teenagers like you and me . . . it makes you feel like you can be as amazing as that [the teenager characters]" (Book Sniffing Fangirl). Book Sniffing Fangirl's insistence that dystopian YA teaches youth "how to be . . . leader[s]" aligns with Bertagna's hypothesis that youth personally identify with the characters (Book Sniffing Fangirl). Scott Westerfeld (author of *Uglies*) argues that literary dystopias generally flourish at times of extreme social control, and that children and youth experience periods of extreme social control more consistently than adults:

> Within school walls, students have reduced expectations of privacy, no freedom of the press, and their daily reality includes clothing restrictions, rising and sitting at the command of ringing bells, and an ever-increasing amount of electronic surveillance. ("Teens and Dystopias") [58]

Westerfeld notes that youths' lives are "defined by rules," and in response "they construct their identities through confrontations with authority . . . leav[ing] teens highly interested in issues of

---

[58] Literary dystopias flourishing at times of extreme social control certainly appears to be true following the American election of President Donald Trump. Jill Lepore calls 2017 a "Golden Age for Dystopian Fiction," and she examines the proliferation of spring 2017 dystopian titles for adults: "pick your present-day dilemma; there's a new dystopian novel to match it" ("Golden Age"). This resurgence has been aided in part by the critically successful Hulu television adaptation of Margaret Atwood's *The Handmaid's Tale* (1985), and the novel has reappeared on several bestseller lists. Atwood's dystopian society, that features extreme subjugation of women justified by Christian doctrines, has been compared to the Trump administration's treatment of women: for example, the attempt to include menstrual irregularities, rape, domestic violence, and pregnancy as pre-existing medical conditions, making it more difficult to receive health insurance coverage. Interestingly, the popularity of dystopian texts for children and youth has waned in favour of realistic fiction that tackle "present day dilemmas." For example, Angie Thomas's *The Hate U Give* (2017), about a sixteen-year-old African American girl who witnesses her unarmed best friend being fatally shot by a police officer, has held top spot on *The New York Times* "YA Best Sellers List" for twenty-two weeks as of 13 August 2017. In the case of *The Hate U Give*'s subject matter, the reality of fatal police violence needs no dystopic lens.

social control" ("Teens and Dystopias"). Westerfeld's and Bertagna's arguments posit that dystopian fiction may function as a form of wish fulfilment for youth readers—a form of social dreaming. Book Sniffing Fangirl's explanation for why she values YA dystopian aligns with Westerfeld's and Bertagna's arguments that dystopian narratives are empowering to youth readers because of the depiction of youth as capable of transforming their restrictive societies.

Like other YA dystopian fiction, YA dystopian school stories participate in several genres. Utopian literature and dystopian literature are considered distinct genres in adult literature, but are not separate genres within children's and YA literatures; rather, utopian and dystopian tropes and themes are integrated into the literature (Hintz [2002]; Bradford et al. [2011].; Day et al. [2014]; Basu et al. [2013]).[59] Dystopian tropes pair well with the common tension in YA literature of individuality and budding subjectivity versus conformity to community and society. Roberta Seelinger Trites notes that YA protagonists' attempts to understand their own agency by struggling against institutions is a significant trend (9), and characters do so by "interrogating social constructions, foregrounding the relationship between the society and the individual" (20). Balaka Basu et al. sense a comparable struggle between self and society in children's literatures with dystopian tendencies, and they argue that dystopian writings' power to "frighten and warn" leads readers to engage with persisting global concerns such as "liberty and self-determination, environmental destruction and looming catastrophe,

[59] Genre blurring is also present in adult dystopian fictions. Raffaella Baccolini and Tom Moylan argue it has become increasingly common for utopian and dystopian literature to "self-reflexively borrow … specific conventions from other genres" (7). Borrowing conventions enables authors to blur and expand the expected boundaries of utopia and dystopia and this increases the "creative potential for critical expression" (7). The authors use Margaret Atwood's *The Handmaid's Tale* as a genre-blurring example in that the dystopian narrative employs conventions of the diary and epistolary novel. Baccolini and Moylan argue that genre-blurring "represents resistance to a hegemonic ideology that reduces everything to a global monoculture" (8), and such resistance is stronger in children's, YA, and adult dystopian genre-blurring fiction.

questions of identity, and the increasingly fragile boundaries between technology and the self" (1). Similarly, Clare Bradford et al. contend that "utopian and dystopian tropes carry out important social, cultural, and political work by challenging and reformulating ideas about power and identity, community, the body, spatio-temporal change, and ecology" (2). Rowan Ellis, a grade twelve student, likewise claims it is important for youth to read dystopian YA because, "it allows us to extrapolate out what our current situations could be doing to the future of us as human beings, as societies, as people and what it's doing to the planet" (Ellis). Carrie Hintz argues that dystopian YA fiction includes "an exploration of the political life of the individual" as the consideration of characters' subjectivity in relation to larger society has implications and revitalizing potentials for entire civilizations (225).

YA literature's concern with adolescent subjectivity takes on political ramifications in dystopian narratives. Conversely, the surface ideologies in lethal violence school stories do not tie the aggressive behaviours detailed to larger systemic forces that produce the school spaces, and in doing so they fail to make the crucial connection between the individual and society, or between education/schools and broader systemic social constructions. In dystopian school stories, the problems youth characters face in their school spaces are situated within the larger socio-cultural context; the individual students' problems are put within the context of larger public issues. In dystopian texts more generally, communities thought to benefit the majority are revealed through adolescent characters' critical examinations to be "repressive patriarchies" structured to benefit those in power (Bradford et al., 11). Similar to the youth-authored school stories in Chapter Two, dystopian characters rethink social values and structures they once blindly accepted, and they actively resist and rebel against old orders to recreate their societies as "more egalitarian, more progressive, and, ultimately, more free" (Day et al. 3). Hintz believes

that the portrayal of adolescent dissent as being capable of reforming larger society, which is absent in lethal violence school stories, is significant in that it makes "clear that young people must be integrated into political life," and provides youth readers "the impression that they have the capacity to remake or revision society anew" (263). Bradford et al. extend this notion by suggesting it is the *responsibility* of young people to integrate themselves into political life, and YA dystopian fiction raises important questions of "how far human beings are responsible for their own actions, and in what ways they might be deprived of this responsibility" (17). Characters grapple to define what their responsibilities to society are and they come to discover themselves as accountable in challenging the egregious flaws of their dystopian societies, for to do nothing when oppressive structures are made apparent translates to continued compliance in these systems.

Abbie Ventura argues that adolescents are commonly marked as passive citizens in Western society and as unable to enact "a model of social change under the conditions of social capitalism" as a result of the pervasive belief that children and youth exist outside adult governing structures (92). This is true of the lethal violence school stories that firmly situate school violence and bullying exclusively as a youth problem, rather than positioning these behaviours within a larger context—such as, mental health stigmas, access to healthcare, personal family histories, societal structures and ideologies, ways in which violence and mental illness are aggravated by social contexts informed by neoliberalism, access to weapons, and so forth. The texts imagine youths' ability to intervene as limited to developing empathy for their peers, and they do not imagine methods by which youth characters could engage with adult governing structures to reform their school spaces. In comparison, dystopian school stories directly challenge the belief that children and youth exist outside adult governing structures, and

instead represent children and youth as entrenched in these governing structures. The characters' schools function as a locus of political governance, and yet student characters are denied participation because of their youth status. The novels depict student characters who claim their right of participation, and this may provide implied readers a "better knowledge of their [youths'] capacity for social change" in presenting "models of citizenship outside of idealized youth status" (Ventura 92). Like many YA readers, the characters are students, and their dissent and rebellions implicate youth readers in the importance of being active political citizens. The novels dream of youths' capability to influence, intervene in, and reform society.

Inverting the Panopticon: "Sousveillance"

The net of discipline in the fictional dystopian school spaces is extremely pervasive because surveillance technologies are embedded into the school buildings, material objects, and the students' bodies. Steven Mann et al. argue that institutions, including schools, have attempted to make surveillance technologies mundane and invisible by implanting the technologies into the structures of buildings, objects, and bodies ("Sousveillance" 332). These researchers believe that surveillance society, which makes public surveillance of private spaces seem inescapable, can be resisted through the reversal of technologies' gaze from the private individual to those who control the gaze. Mann et al. term this "inverse panopticon" *sous*veillance, and they combine the French words "sous" (below) and "veiller" (to watch) to describe a surveillance from the bottom up ("Sousveillance" 332). Surveillance once accepted as an inescapable reality, protagonists in dystopian school stories refuse to passively accept the restrictions of surveillance and they evade and reappropriate surveillance technologies to observe the actions of the observers (adults in positions of authority) through sousveillance tactics.

Sousveillance is a form of "reflectionism," another term coined by Mann ("Reflectionism") to describe disorienting methods of using technology to "mirror and confront bureaucratic organizations" ("Sousveillance" 333), by "not only appropriating the tools of the oppressor, but by turning those same tools against the oppressor" ("Reflectionism" 95). The appropriation of the observer's tools uncovers and undercuts the privileges of observers. Reflectionism becomes sousveillance when "individuals use tools to observe the organizational observer" by accessing and collecting data about their own surveillance in order to neutralize it ("Sousveillance" 333). Sousveillance is a form of "space protection" in which individuals "through non-compliance and interference 'moves' that block, distort, mask, refuse, and counter-surveil the collection of information" to resist surveillance ("Sousveillance" 333). For example, individuals who record videos on smartphones of their interactions with the police check the power used by "social controllers" through their own surveillance of the "organizational observer." More subtle forms of sousveillance involve the choices individuals make in what personal information to share online. For example, a common practice when registering for any digital platform is to require users to provide a full name, gender, birthdate, email address, and even countries and cities of residence. Correct information in all categories is not necessary to gain access to many platforms. To provide incorrect or incomplete information during "sign-up procedures" is a subtle form of sousveillance in that the deception blocks, masks, and distorts personal information collected and neutralizes the extent of surveillance.

Students in YA dystopian school stories employ sousveillance tactics to resist and rebel against their oppressive school spaces. Sousveillance opens the possibility for students to be politically engaged in a space with a pervasive net of discipline that attempts to bar students from political participation. Characters rebel against the movements and interactions their school

spaces construct for them by co-opting surveillance systems to increase their own knowledge of the space and to deploy evasive tactics that curtail adult power by limiting their surveillance of students. Through evaded surveillance and by conducting their own surveillance, both accomplished with sousveillance tactics, students hold adults accountable for their actions by making the observers observable.

The quality of rebellion differs in each narrative as some engage in sousveillance rebellions that utilize the tactics of their oppressors, or do not offer substantial alternatives to the previous hegemonic power structures. Regardless of the quality of the rebellions, all three narratives represent their youth characters as politically engaged and capable of overthrowing/reforming repressive and exploitative hegemonic states. Authors construct sousveillance and political engagement as the responsibilities of their youth characters: to do nothing would mean characters further and strengthen the structures that manipulate and oppress them.

In Card's *Ender's Game* and *Ender's Shadow,* protagonist Bean is able to equalize the power imbalance between himself and adults in the school space, but his rebellion is limited in scope by being only an individual, rather than collective, resistance. By contrast, sousveillance practices utilized by protagonist, Cia, in Charbonneau's *The Testing* trilogy implicate youth in their responsibility to be active political citizens, but Cia's rebellion is questionable in that it employs the ruling powers' methods of oppression to achieve reform. Kincaid's *Insignia* trilogy offers the most successful example of student rebellion through sousveillance: a collective resistance uses sousveillance to unveil the atrocities of the hegemonic powers to the global community. Students successfully overthrow systemic corrupt structures, and the global society built in its place offers real alternatives that make knowledge equally accessible. Each example

presents the school space as the locus of political power in that the (successful) socialization of students ensures the continuation of the current ruling powers. Although the quality of students' rebellions differs, each protagonist engages in sousveillance tactics and shows the novels' "social dreaming" that an alternative to pervasive and seemingly inescapable surveillance is possible, and that youth, at least in these dystopian fictions, have the ability to reform their societies through political engagement.

Bean's Sousveillance From the Shadows

The parallel novels by Orson Scott Card, *Ender's Game* and *Ender's Shadow*, feature a dystopian society altered by conflict. The novels take place at Battle School—that houses elementary to high school aged students—with *Ender's Game* told from the perspective of Ender, a nine year old student at Battle School, and *Ender's Shadow* from the perspective of Bean, another student at Battle School, who is five years younger than Ender.[60] An interstellar war with an alien species called the Buggers is narrowly won by humans, and humanity obsessively prepares for an expected retaliatory invasion. In preparation, the International Fleet (I.F.) founds Battle School and propagates it as the key to humanity's future defeat of the Buggers.[61] The school, which orbits around Earth, is devoted to the development of gifted children into the military leaders needed to win the anticipated conflict. Nearly every child on Earth is monitored by I.F. through surveillance chips that permit I.F. observers to see and hear

[60] For more on the parallel novels' "double vision" see Christine Doyle and Susan Louise Stewart's essay "*Ender's Game* and *Ender's Shadow*: Orson Scott Card's Postmodern School Stories" (2004).

[61] This is a similar sentiment to that of the "Preparedness Movements" (discussed in Chapter Two) that were founded on the belief that the best way to achieve and maintain peace is to be prepared for war.

from the perspective of the body that carries the chip. Children, male and female alike, who demonstrate "potential brilliance in military command" are recruited to Battle School (*Shadow* 153).

War ships are piloted remotely, and Ender commands a team of child soldiers between the ages of six and fifteen to annihilate the Bugger species during what they are made to believe by their adult teachers are battle simulations. The adults in charge believe the young soldiers may be inhibited by compassion if they are made aware that their actions have life and death consequences, and thus I.F. deceives their students into committing genocide. Ender's teachers reveal, after he wins the final "simulation", that everything was "[r]eal. Not a game" (*Game* 297), and Ender is traumatized by the reality of his actions. Ender is further devastated when he discovers I.F. overstated the threat of a Bugger attack in order to gain, and remain in control of, the highly gifted child soldiers: "[T]he main purpose of the Battle School was to get these kids off Earth so that they could not become commanders of the armies of any one nation or faction" (*Shadow* 153). Rather than protecting humanity, the child soldiers of Battle School are manipulated into guarding I.F.'s military power and control over earth, and this tarnishes the heroic mandate of the program. As in other dystopian texts, an organization that had promoted itself as working for the good of all is revealed to be a shrewd and repressive system concerned with achieving its own selfish interests, and which, as Ellis, the youth reviewer previously quoted, asserts can encourage implied youth readers to "extrapolate" how these repressive structures may be similar to those governing their own lives.

Battle School's Participation in, and Expansion of, Golden Age School Story Conventions

Card's school stories participate in and extend Golden Age school story conventions and shape the narratives as a return to Victorian values and structures. Card does not glorify these Victorian structures, but rather the persistent links to Victorian values and ideologies expose their oppressive nature and need for reform. Battle School closely resembles the prestigious and elite Victorian public schools whose students were considered the best of society and which provided an education that promised the preservation and promotion of British colonial and domestic domination. Rosemary Auchmuty attributes the common consideration of public schools and their education, that was perpetrated and sustained by the ethos of public schools, being "a privilege that open[ed] doors to greater opportunity and choice," as declining substantially when education become "freely available and taken for granted, if not actively disliked" ("School Stories"). Card, as well as Charbonneau and Kincaid, does away with the notion of school as mundane and ordinary and reinjects a sense of "specialness" into the school space with the selective nature of who is *invited* to attend Battle School and the promised excellence of graduates.

The Battle School's student recruitment process fuels the elite perception of the school, its students, and its graduates. Recruitment is a global competition and I.F. employs panoptic methods to observe as many children on Earth as possible. Like millions of other children, Ender is implanted with a monitor chip and is closely observed by I.F.'s command central (*Game* 23). Because of Ender's unparalleled intelligence, compassion, empathy, and (paradoxically) killer instinct (*Game* 19) he is recruited to Battle School at the tender age of six and believed by many to be humanity's greatest hope of defeating the Buggers (*Game* 1). Conversely, Bean is found at four years old living on the streets of Rotterdam by a nun who acts as a "talent scout" for I.F.

Bean's ability to manipulate those around him to accomplish his own agenda impresses the nun (*Shadow* 45), who intercedes on his behalf for his admittance to Battle School (*Shadow* 80). At school, Bean's intelligence and social instincts make him Ender's runner-up for saviour of Earth (*Shadow* 170). Ender and Bean are presented as exceptional children, but their Battle School peers are, by normal standards, also brilliant and depicted as the "cream" of the global crop. Simply to be chosen from the millions of others monitored marks Battle School students as special: a designation every child hopes for when he or she is implanted with the monitoring chip (*Game* 10). The desire to be found special and important is fulfilled by being invited to be a student at Battle School.

The school spaces in Card's, Charbonneau's, and Kincaid's narratives are all enclosed spaces accessible only to students and staff. The spaces have surveillance technologies embedded into the school's architecture that pervasively implicate adult power over students. Because of the surveillance technologies' integration into the architecture, the building of Battle School is in itself a surveillance device, a panoptic structure, that is run by adult I.F. personnel who are able to continuously observe, control, and manipulate students' movements and interactions within the space. Adult control over student bodies is taken a step further in that the environment of the school (the air, gravity, light, food, and so on) is controlled by the adult administration; the very air students breathe is granted by the adults in charge. Teachers are elevated beyond the typical power of the headmaster or headmistresses to a godlike status as they are capable of controlling the life and death of their students.

Obedience and loyalty to the Battle School community is fostered by the partition-organization of student bodies. As was explored in Chapter One and Two, public schools are broken down into school houses which intensifies the competition between students to ensure

they work hard to outperform their rivals and also simultaneously nurtures loyalty to their houses. Students at Battle School are organized into "armies" that function much the same way as public-school houses by homogenizing individual students into the community and redirecting any familial or egotistical loyalty towards their army. Students are expected to stay within their army's designated area in the battle station, and this makes it difficult to form relationships with members of rival armies and further intensifies competition between armies. The method of partitioning by armies enables the adult teachers and administrators to observe, control, and manipulate how students move and interact with peers in the school space.

Unlike public schools, where students remain in a single house for the duration of their education, Battle School staff frequently redistribute students between armies. The organization of students in the enclosed space of Battle School is Victorian in nature, but the repeated reorganization introduces a deeper level of competition that is similar to the schools depicted in the lethal violence school stories that are informed by neoliberal values that "destroy communal bonds, dehumaniz[es] the other, and pit[s] individuals against the communities they inhabit" (Giroux, *Education* 15). Much like the competitive relationships depicted in the lethal violence school stories, Battle School's disciplinary tactics create an intensified culture of cruelty. Even with the school's (false) public mandate of protecting humanity, the disciplinary practices used in Battle School motivate students by competition and destroy communal bonds between peers. Much as the lethal violence school stories present school spaces that claim to be predicated on a social non-violent contract, the values Battle School claims to endorse (protecting humanity, caring for communities) are more of an ideal than a lived reality. The continual reorganization of student bodies impedes the development of intimate relationships, romantic or platonic, as students are expected to display immediate loyalty to their current army and shun relationships

formed in previous detachments. Frequently reordering bodies between armies restricts the possibility of students developing fidelity towards specific students, isolates individuals within a community, and fosters student allegiance to school staff (who remain the only constant) above all by obediently forming and destroying attachments as directed.

Similar to the house system in public schools and the stories about them, members of an army eat, sleep, take lessons, and compete together against the other school armies in highly competitive war simulations called Battle Games. Battle School students take classes in "mathematics and computers. . . . Military history. Strategy and tactics," but the most valuable lessons are learned "in the Battle Room" (*Game* 23). Card extends the tyranny of games first seen in Hughes' *Tom Brown,* and repeated throughout the entire subgenre, with Battle School's mandate that students' "real education was the game" (*Game* 259). The Battle of Waterloo was thought to be won by public-school boys on the Rugby playing fields; in lethal violence school stories, varsity athletes are believed to be the best socialized by their high school athletic pedagogy for successful adult careers in a neoliberal, competitive, corporate society; likewise, Battle School staff instil the belief that victory against the Buggers will be built in the Battle Games, which elevates the outcomes of the simulations above any academic test scores. Each army's wins and losses are displayed on a scoreboard in the communal school dining room, the only space in which the entire student body convenes (*Game* 41). The scoreboard determines an army's social position within the school, and the Battle Games' statistics are directly linked to an army's, and its individual members', success within the school space. From *Tom Brown*, to the youth-authored school stories, and to the lethal violence school stories, athletic performance is represented as the main determinant in students' social standing and is thought by students' teachers and adult society at large to be indicative of his or her success upon graduation. Battle

School is structured on these same values, as an individual's self-worth is determined by the performance of his or her present army, and the army's value and social standing in the school is determined by its performance in the Battle Games.

The Surveillance Tactics at Battle School

The technology embedded within the physical structures of Battle School makes it a panopticon: students are seen, but they do not see; they are the objects of information (Foucault 200). Card's novels extend the panoptic capabilities of the school space with imagined future technology that increases the type and amount of data collected on students, and this expands staff's knowledge of students to better manipulate them. The building itself is an enclosed, segmented space in which every corner is observable through surveillance devices, and all behaviours of students are supervised and recorded (Foucault 197). Essential to Bentham's panopticon was the inmates' participation in the power structures. As previously described in my Introduction, the panopticon was imagined as a tower in the centre of an annular building, and from the tower an observer had access to observe the entire building. "By the effect of backlighting, one can observe from the tower, standing out precisely against the light" so that inmates can witness the outline of the observer, but are never sure when and by whom they are being observed (Foucault 200). The inmate participates in his or her own discipline because of the backlight making it visible that he or she is being observed, and thus the inmate "inscribes in himself the power relation in which he simultaneously plays both roles; he becomes the principle of his own subjection" (202-3).

Bentham's backlight takes several forms at Battle School, but it is first made apparent to students through the monitor chips they wear prior to being admitted to Battle School. The majority of Battle School students had monitor chips prior to their enrolment and were directly

informed that the chip made their every action observable to I.F, and this positions the chips as a symbolic backlight that makes surveillance visible to those being observed. The chips are removed when children enter Battle School, but students are cognizant of I.F.'s surveillance capabilities because of their prior experience being chipped, and students assume they can be monitored, observed, and judged at any moment. An awareness of surveillance "assures the automatic functioning of power" because students play both roles of the discipliner and disciplined by managing their actions to impress observers (Foucault 201). Students' manipulation of their own behaviours—such as remaining within their approved army's areas, and not speaking with students outside their army—is done with the intention of swaying the organizational observers, and this "increases [the] production" (Foucault 208), of Battle School by ensuring that the desired militant characteristics of competitive aggression are fostered in students.

Although students are aware they can be observed at any moment, some surveillance is conducted covertly because, as one teacher explains during a private I.F. meeting, "It isn't good for them [students] to know how much we know about them" (*Shadow* 120). Loaded on students' personal desks (similar to a digital tablet) is a fantasy game that students play during leisure hours. Most students consider the game purely recreational and are unaware that teachers monitor the gameplay to learn more about students' characters (*Game* 62). Before he even plays, Bean comprehends the game to be a surveillance device and the purpose for it: "The fact that they had that fantasy game on every desk suggested that they were looking at the personality as well. Character. In the end, Bean suspected, character mattered more than intelligence" (*Shadow* 127). Ender plays the game nightly and is oblivious that teachers learn from the decisions he makes in the game about his fears, desires, and aggressive tendencies. The knowledge gleaned

from the gameplay assists in I.F.'s manipulation of Ender in order to motivate him to continue his training and ultimately destroy the Buggers for them. At Battle School, there is no corner in which to hide from the observing and judging gaze of the adults in power.

Bean's Sousveillance

Bean is suspicions of I.F.'s intentions from the moment of his recruitment: "from that moment, trust was gone" (*Shadow* 80). Bean's doubts motivate his resistance to surveillance much sooner than Ender, who believes the I.F.'s touted intentions for the majority of *Ender's Game*. Bean, an exceptionally bright four-year-old, realizes upon arriving at Battle School that "[e]verything the children did here was shaped by adults" and he recognizes "the key to everything was understanding the teachers" (*Shadow* 99). Bean apprehends that knowledge is power at Battle School, and since "teachers had all the power" from the knowledge continually gathered from their invasive surveillance tactics, "the only safety here was to subvert the teacher's influence" (*Shadow* 100). To understand the teachers, Bean employs sousveillance tactics both to control the information that is gathered about him and to gather his own information about those who observe him, and this greatly threatens the power imbalance of the space.

Bean uses sousveillance to distort, block, and limit the amount of information that is gathered about him by the teachers. One means of blocking and limiting information gathered is Bean's refusal to play the fantasy game loaded on the school desktops. Bean apprehends the intention of the game and self-consciously refuses to play in order to limit the information that can be learned from the gameplay. Limiting the data that teachers utilize to create individualized manipulation tactics to motivate students makes it more difficult for staff to manipulate Bean. The teachers order Bean to play the game (*Shadow* 142), which betrays the anxiety Bean's

sousveillance causes them by restricting the control they have over him. Bean disobeys the order to play, and his refusal is an act of resistance mediated through sousveillance in that it continues to limit and block surveillance. Mann et al. argue that sousveillance is "an act of liberation" because it levels "the surveillance playing field" (347). In his twice-fold denial of participation in the fantasy game's data collection Bean restricts the extent to which staff can manipulate and control his actions (Card, *Shadow* 127, 148), ultimately "disrupt[ing] the power relationships of surveillance" by empowering himself (Mann et al. 347).

Students, while not directly informed by I.F., assume their uniforms contain tracking devices to monitor their movements in the space (*Shadow* 170). Bean also correctly guesses at the uniforms' tracking devices: he sheds his uniform at night and climbs naked through the station's air vents to gather his own surveillance on the teachers (*Shadow* 171-80). This action is a three-fold rebellion and resistance of the school space. First, the act of shedding his uniform because it contains a tracking device blocks and distorts the information gathered on his movements and masks the knowledge of his nightly surveillance. Second, by observing the oblivious staff, Bean gains knowledge of the teachers. Bean increases his power in the space by levelling the disparity of knowledge between himself and the teachers, and this limits the extent to which teachers can manipulate and control him. Thirdly, Bean's use of the air vents as a path to move through the school undetected significantly reappropriates the school space and enables him to resist and remake the space. As discussed in my Introduction, Michel de Certeau notes that the possibilities of movement are organized by the "creators" or city planners, but the directions a walker chooses "makes them exist as well as emerge," and that in moving "he invents others, since the crossing, drifting away . . . transform or abandon spatial elements" (98). A walker can be either limited by the route laid out before him or her by the creators ("he goes

only here and not there") or, like Bean, the walker can "increase the number of possibilities" by "making choices among the signifiers of the spatial 'language' or by displacing them through the use he makes of them" (98-9). Bean displaces the spatial language of the air vents by reappropriating their use to invent and increase the methods of movement in the school space. Bean's invented "paths" run counter to the intentions of the space's "creators" and facilitators, and this demonstrates that Bean is living actively within the school space. Bean also creates a literal pathway that opens up the possibility for sousveillance that equalizes the power structures of the space.

Most of Bean's acts of resistance are performed alone; however, he enlists his peers in one act of rebellion with the intention of restructuring how students relate to one another in the school space with the removal of a significant spatial signifier: the cafeteria scoreboard. The scoreboard, much like bullying in the lethal violence school stories, "creates a culture of cruelty . . . crushing any viable notion of common good and public life" by fueling aggressive competition between peers (Giroux, *Education* 13). Hung in the only communal space in the school, the scoreboard tracks and displays how students measure against one another and this infuses competition into students' relationships. Bean comprehends that the scoreboard ensures student aggression is directed towards each other and never the adults, and that this negatively manipulates students' relationships and creates a culture of hostile cruelty. In an impassioned speech to his peers, Bean simultaneously makes students aware of how spatial codes like the scoreboard control how they interact with one another, and he outlines his vision for a school space informed by feelings of community instead of competition:

> We're not each other's enemies. . . . We're supposed to be allies. We should be learning from each other, sharing information and ideas. We should feel free to experiment, trying

> new things without being afraid of how it will affect our standings. That board up there, that's the teachers game, getting us to turn against each other. . . . I want to learn from you. . . . I don't want to compete with you for some empty rank that the teachers put up on that wall in order to manipulate us.. . . We don't have to play their game. We can take charge of our own education and get ready to fight the real enemy. We have to remember, always, who the real enemy is. . . . Yeah [,] the teachers. (*Shadow* 341-43)

The scoreboard stifles the possibility of communal bonds and signifies the "dos and don'ts" of student behaviour in the space, "bring[ing] us back to power. The space indeed 'speaks'—but it does not tell all. Above all, it prohibits" (Lefebvre 142). The scoreboard prohibits the formation of a supportive community and demonstrates the power adults have over student relationships. The student community ultimately chooses not to value the data displayed on the scoreboard, and this alters peer relationships to be built on community rather than competition. The students' boycott of the scoreboard also symbolizes the adults' loss of control over how students interact with one another.

The students enthusiastically meet Bean's call to action and live actively in the space by boycotting the scoreboard (*Shadow* 343). No longer placing value in the results displayed on the scoreboard, students repurpose Battle School into a democratic community. The Battle Games are transformed into a supportive and encouraging space in which students share their knowledge with one another to strengthen the entire student body. The competitive tyranny of games is replaced with critical pedagogy in which students "come to terms with their own power as critical agents" and create "a sphere where the unconditional freedom to question and assert one's voice is central to the purpose of education" (Giroux *Education,* 125). In this instance, this dystopian school story offers a solution to the neoliberal social, cultural, and political problems

identified in the lethal violence school stories: collective resistance against oppressive systemic forces. Through Bean's leadership, adults' authority in the space is largely usurped and Battle School is for a *brief* moment transformed into a utopia of critical education in which children and youth are active agents in their own education. I.F. personnel are still able to surveil the students, but the students no longer care that they are being watched because success has been redefined, by the students themselves, in terms of community progress. The adult power afforded by surveillance is minimized when students' loyalties are redirected away from adults and their "empty ranks" and towards building up and supporting one another.

The longevity of this transformation is not explored, as Bean is transferred to Command School where Ender is tricked into committing genocide against the Bugger species (*Shadow* 367). Unfortunately, Bean does not learn from his most successful rebellion the importance of collective resistance and community in achieving wide reaching reform. Ender, Bean, and other extraordinary students are promoted to Command School and told they will be judged and assigned their command postings based on their final battle simulations (*Shadow* 373). The weeks of simulations are in truth actual battles, and the students, led by Ender, completely obliterate the Bugger species. From the information gathered in his sousveillance, Bean uncovers the truth of the "simulations" but chooses not to share the truth with his team (*Shadow* 392). Bean does not learn the key piece of information that the Buggers have no intention of returning to Earth, and thus believes the genocide is justified: "The teachers were right to keep this secret from us. . . . I can't tell anyone" (*Shadow* 392). While Bean has more knowledge, and thus more power, than any other student, his decisions regarding how to use his power offer no real alternatives to the current corrupt structures because he withholds information to manipulate the behaviours of his teammate, just as the I.F. does.

Alone, Bean is able to equalize much of the disparity in power between the adults and himself, but in remaining alone I.F. is still able to manipulate Bean and others to achieve their selfish and atrocious agenda. Bean does not achieve long-lasting reforms, and his sousveillance benefits him personally rather than successfully reappropriating hegemonic power structures in a significant way. Bean's limited rebellion is similar to the perpetrators of lethal school violence in the previous chapter, who reinscribe the very structures and hierarchies they were reacting/rebelling against with their violent "exits." Bean abides by the secretive practices he rebels against in choosing not to involve the student collective, as he had previously, in his continuing resistance. Giroux argues that "mass-based social movement[s]" are crucial to the "defeat of the prevailing concentrated economic and political forces" ("Striking"), and Bean limits the impact of his resistance in remaining isolated.

Card's novels imbue distrust and suspicion of hegemonic states and their use of surveillance to control and manipulate the populace. The narratives offer possibilities for resistance and rebellion through sousveillance and collective resistance, but Bean's rebellions are largely unsuccessful, and society remains unchanged at the conclusion of both novels and well into the prophetic series. In the most recent *Ender* instalment, *Children of the Fleet* (2017), peace has finally come to Earth following several major wars that were controlled by students and graduates of Battle School. The Battle School staff are criminally charged for their treatment of students, and the school is refurbished into a colonization school (Fleet School) to prepare leaders to colonize space—this aligns Battle School even more closely with the colonial agenda of Golden Age public schools. Yet, while the "principal" of Battle School, Colonel Graff, is charged with, and pleads guilty to, his morally questionable treatment of students. Graff receives

minimal punishment for his guilty plea because he "saved" Earth from the Buggers, implying the ends justify the means, and he is put in charge of the new colonial Fleet School.

Although Card's *Ender* world has yet to reform its dystopian society in a significant way, the author continually depicts children and youth as intellectual equals to adults and as capable of disrupting corrupt power imbalances. Bean is one of many children and youth in Card's series who challenge their hegemonic society, and sousveillance is a common tactic of their rebellions and resistances. Like their adult counterparts, these young characters are flawed and crave power, which ultimately limits the success of their rebellions—as it did for Bean. Regardless of the sustained corrupt nature of Card's universe, the ability of youth characters to significantly disrupt hegemonic structures through sousveillance communicates the disruptive power youth could have in being politically active and questioning the "inescapable" nature of adult power and control.

Sousveillance in *The Testing*

The Testing protagonist, Cia, inserts herself at the heart of her society's political struggles, but, similar to Bean, the success of Cia's rebellion is limited in her solitary pursuits and is suspect because she employs the same tactics as her oppressors—namely, murder and manipulation. Joelle Charbonneau's *The Testing* trilogy takes place in a future where Earth has been decimated by war and natural disasters. Groups of survivors live in colonies spread over North America in what is called the United Commonwealth. The colonies, though separated by great distances, work together to revitalize this inhospitable planet. Each colony specializes in the production of particular resources that are distributed among the Commonwealth or develops technologies aimed at natural regeneration. Tosu City, the capital of the colonies, manages communications

between the colonies and organizes the dispersal of resources and revitalization projects. Although there is much work to be accomplished in the revival processes, the United Commonwealth is initially presented as a utopian society in which all work together, free of conflict, towards a common goal. Cia,[62] the trilogy's sixteen-year-old protagonist, gathers information from her sousveillance on the governing practices of the United Commonwealth. Cia discovers that the state, in actuality, is using totalitarian methods to focus the energies of citizens towards singular goals that are the most beneficial to those in power and prevent the upward mobility of those in the colonies.

Children and youth attend school in the colony of their birth until the age of sixteen. The most promising students' examination scores are sent to Tosu City, and an elite few, such as the protagonist Cia, are selected as "Testing" candidates to compete in rounds of examinations for entry into University.[63] Similar to the graduates of Battle School, the graduates of University represent the United Commonwealth's "great hope" for the future, and all colonies rely on University graduates to "regenerate the earth and improve our quality of life. They are the future scientists, doctors, teachers, and government officials" (*Testing* 21). Also, as in Battle School and its public-school ancestors, the prestige associated with being a University graduate, and the

---

[62] The unique name "Cia" does beg allusions to the C.I.A (the United States' Central Intelligence Agency). Whether or not this was intended, Cia conducts secretive surveillance on her peers, teachers, and Commonwealth government officials that includes recording private conversations which fairly positions her as a physical embodiment of the C.I.A.

[63] "The Testing" involves four rounds of examinations: written exams on math, science, history, and reading comprehension; hands-on puzzle-solving with lethal results if directions are not followed; a group problem-solving project, with more lethal consequences if members cannot trust one another; and a survival challenge in which remaining candidates trek hundreds of miles from Chicago to Tosu City. The final examination is highly reminiscent of the *Hunger Games* arena in that some candidates murder their competition to improve their chances, and The Testing administrators insert life-threatening challenges into the course.

repeated myth propagated by the state that graduates will be the saviours of society, children are socialized to believe the greatest achievement possible is to be a University graduate.

Manipulation through Competition

Much as the I.F's observations of children using monitor chips determines who attends Battle School, The Testing process determines who attends University. Only University graduates are allowed to work in government positions—in other words, the only opportunity for children of the colonies for upward mobility, and to be meaningfully integrated into political life, is to be a university graduate. The current state desires to maintain the status quo to preserve its and its families' privileges, and the process of candidate selection is imperative in this maintenance. Every colonist knows of and strives to attend The Testing, but the actual process is cloaked in secrecy as a result of the erasure of Testing candidates' memories following the examinations. Families are provided limited information as to what becomes of their children because candidates, regardless of their success, are assigned work in colonies other than the ones into which they have been born. The darkest secret of The Testing is the lethal consequences of the examinations, and that candidates who survive the four rounds of Testing, but do not score high enough to attend University, are enslaved as test subjects in the Commonwealth's insidious scientific experiments. The Testing designers and administrators, who hold high positions in the government and University, are the few individuals to know the details of The Testing. The Testing and the extreme mystery that surrounds it is a form of surveillance that gathers information on the candidates in order to determine which individuals will be most productive and useful to the state. Candidates/potential students are put at a disadvantage as the erasure of their memories hides their *own* knowledge from them, and those they come into contact with,

about what data has been collected and the atrocities committed. The erasure hides and ensures the continuation of the insidious processes of The Testing, conceals how these processes benefit The Testing administrators, and makes invisible the culling of the colonies' youth.

Testing candidates, like Battle School students, are held in an enclosed space and the compound is rigged with technology for The Testing administrators to observe candidates unrestrictedly during examinations, in their dormitories, and in common areas. Administrators continually observe unaware candidates, and behaviour between exams is judged and measured as rigorously as the formalized examinations—just as Bean uncovered with the I.F., the Testing administrators care as much about character as they do intelligence. The observers place great value on candidates' competitive nature, and the extent to which candidates are willing to go to impress the judges suggests their potential obedience to governing powers and success within a model that mirrors corporate neoliberalism. Similar to how the "corporate vision" of neoliberalism reduces "the culture of schooling" to "the culture of business and an armed camp" in YA lethal violence school stories (Giroux, "Striking"), institutionalized education in *The Testing* is deeply rooted in a competitive corporate culture.

The enclosure's influence on relationships is dramatically illustrated in Cia's interactions with her roommate, Ryme. The characters are not united by their shared experience, but competition infuses their relationship with aggression. Cia admits she was unable to finish every section of a written test, and Ryme views this admission as an opportunity to attack and possibly weaken a rival. Wearing a "manic" smile, Ryme insults Cia, "I guess Five Lakes Colony schools aren't as good as the ones in Dixon. Too bad. One of us won't be around much longer" (*Testing* 89). Cia is taken up in the heat of the aggressive posturing and counters, "I finished the reading section with time to spare. Did you? . . . I guess you're right about one of us going home"

(*Testing* 89). When Cia later returns to their shared room, she finds Ryme "hanging from the ceiling" (*Testing* 92). Ryme's pretences of self-assured arrogance cover her own insecurities, demonstrate the manipulative competition between students, and convey the level of stress associated with the tests. Because of students' value, pride, and dignity being dependent on their success in the examinations and their University studies, living with potential failure is an unimaginable future. Where the two could have been united in their shared experience and formed a commiserative and supportive bond, they have used any sign of failing to chip away at the other's confidence and to improve their own chances at advancement.

Dr. Barnes, the head organizer of The Testing, reinforces that Cia and Ryme's competitive relationship was what the administrators had hoped for. In a macabre scene, Dr. Barnes and Cia watch as Ryme is cut down from her noose, and Dr. Barnes "comforts" Cia with cold words:

> While this is a tragedy, it is better for the entire Commonwealth population to learn now that she is not capable of dealing with the kinds of pressure she would be forced to deal with in the future. This event is unfortunate, but The Testing served its purpose. (*Testing* 94)

Candidates' abilities to withstand the pressure of their rivals is as important as excelling in the examinations, and the unsympathetic aggression candidates direct toward one another works toward the administrators' goals of culling the weak from the herd. This echoes the justification uttered by students and adults in several lethal violence school stories that bullying is an important socialization tool because it prepares students for their competitive adult lives. The justification leaves unsaid that those who cannot withstand such peer relationships or pressure, such as the perpetrators of lethal violence and Ryme, are excluded from full participation in their

school spaces and in adult society upon graduation; or, as Giroux describes, the schools "become zones of social abandonment" in which marginalized students "exist in a state of perpetual danger and fear . . . for whom violence operates routinely" ("Killing Children"). In *The Testing*, candidates exist in perpetual fear of the possible consequences if they are not found suitable or able to "handle the pressure," and this fear transforms other candidates into enemies, as The Testing positions other candidates as the obstacles to one another's success. For example, only a limited number of candidates are accepted to University (regardless if they passed The Testing) each year, so doing better than others is thus essential to a candidate achieving his or her goal of becoming a University graduate. Students' aggression towards one another distracts them from considering how the powerful adult administration, and larger systemic forces that structure the space, manipulate and oppress them.

Cia passes The Testing and is admitted to University, a place where agency is touted but is still controlled by the same methods as The Testing compound. Having initially perceived the University as the destination, Cia realizes it contains yet another series of tests that pits students against one another in order to produce cutthroat graduates who will support the current hegemonic power structures. Acceptance does not guarantee graduation, and students continue to compete against one another for a place within their programs and internships. As it did during The Testing, to succeed at school entails the defeat of one's peers as success is defined in terms of domination– a trope that may mark Charbonneau's society as a dystopia but has, notably, long been present in schools and the stories about them.

While the means of domination are more extreme at Charbonneau's University, a system which defines success in terms of winning and losing is similar to that which Alec Waugh rebelled against in his *Loom of Youth,* was prevalent in Golden Age school stories with the

tyranny of the playing fields, and from which characters chose to exit in the lethal school violence narratives. Similarly, the IRS examined in Chapter Three were structured to achieve the domination of Indigenous peoples by settler Canadians. Charbonneau takes part in the school story subgenre's tradition of domination, and her narrative magnifies, rather than invents, what Giroux assigns as neoliberal capitalism's effect on education as "fueling competitiveness . . . producing atomized subjects, and loosening individuals from any sense of social responsibility" (*America's Education*, 15). As demonstrated in all the school stories examined in this study, an isolated and fractured populace is easier to control than united communities, and the processes of The Testing and the University destroy communal bonds in order to preserve control over them.

Cia's Sousveillance and Questionable Rebellion

Cia's sousveillance begins prior to her University acceptance. Cia's father is a graduate of the University, and though he has no clear recall of the tests because of their erasure from his memory, he confides to Cia that he experiences recurring and disturbing nightmares of an explosion and a young girl "half buried under a slab of concrete, blood running down her face" (*Testing* 33). Cia's father confides this to his daughter so that she goes into the Testing "prepared to question everything you see and everyone you meet" (*Testing* 35). Heeding her father's warning, Cia hides a recording device among her personal belongings and creates an audio diary throughout her Testing period. Cia discovers her own hidden device while at University, and the horrendous atrocities committed during The Testing are undeniable when heard spoken in her own voice (*Independent* 9).

The diary is a rebellious form of sousveillance that provides Cia information on what data had been gathered on herself and on the organizational observers, which tips the scales of power

between adult teachers/government officials and Cia. Recording the audio diary resists the intended disadvantage of memory erasure and influences how Cia moves about the University and Tosu city, and she is exceedingly careful and self-conscious of her interactions with those in positions of power and authority. For example, Cia learns from her audio diary that Professor Holt is the mastermind behind the atrocious practices of the Testing, and having knowledge of the malicious use of his power makes Cia fearful and anxious around him. To hide her anxiety, on one occasion Cia purposefully "curve[s] [her] lips into a smile for Professor Holt, who watches from under a tree fifty feet away" (*Independent* 198), and in another instance she is "careful to keep a pleased expression on my face despite the way my nerves jump as Professor Holt reaches out for my hand" (*Independent* 249). Likewise, learning from her audio diary the role many government officials had in murdering several Testing candidates influences Cia to control her interactions and manipulate her behaviour to gain the trust of these powerful adults. Cia several times forces smiles (*Independent* 30, 43, 71, 182 and *Graduation* 75, 150), and is overtly cheerful and friendly to endear herself to powerful figures and to alleviate any adult teachers, politicians, and peers' potential suspicions about her (*Independent* 264).

Before The Testing begins, candidates are given bracelets and bags with tracking devices embedded within them. Cia guesses at the implanted device in her bracelet and discovers a method of unclasping the jewellery to move about undetected (*Testing* 101), a tactic she employs several times during The Testing to evade surveillance. These same tracking devices are employed at the University, though the observers become suspicious when a device remains still for too long. Cia continues to evade the trackers by carefully removing her bracelet when she should be sleeping so that she may move freely around the campus and city to gather her own surveillance on government officials and the university teachers. During the day, Cia passes her

device to her boyfriend, so it appears the two are moving around together when in actuality Cia is conducting sousveillance in other locations (*Independent* 266). As with Bean, evading the tracking devices enables Cia to conduct her own forms of surveillance on the authority figures of the Testing and University spaces. Her tactics block and distort data the organizational observers collect on her and empower Cia to collect her own information on the observers. For example, when her bracelet travels around campus with her boyfriend, Cia uses this time to upset the balance of power by delivering confidential government documents, which she gained access to through her own behaviour manipulation to gain the trust of government officials, to resistance groups based in the outskirts of the city.

The combination of recovering her memories from The Testing and evading the tracking devices leads Cia down a path of resistance with the goal of making the true nature of The Testing apparent to the colonies in order to reform The Testing and University. However, the efficacy of Cia's resistance is debatable. Jonathan Alexander and Rebecca Black argue that rebellions in YA dystopian novels can often be "as bad as the reigning government or in league with it. The resistances don't necessarily offer real alternatives, but more of the same" (225). This is also true of the lethal violence novels, as characters who choose to "exit" the system do so in violent methods that ultimately reinforce the power hierarchies of their school and surrounding society. Both the perpetrators of lethal violence and Cia temporarily reorder the power hierarchy with themselves in powerful positions, but their doing so does not overtly reform or greatly challenge the systems that have oppressed them.

Cia's resistance is largely undercut with the revelation that the rebel organization she is working with is run by a faction of the government, which includes the President, who are intent on removing the board members of The Testing from power (*Graduation* 46). Cia is convinced

by the rebel group that the only way to obtain reform is to murder several members of government who are attached to The Testing process—the same method (murder) the Testing officials used to determine who would and would not attend University. As well, Cia undertakes her own version of The Testing to assess the loyalty of the peers she has enlisted to help in her rebellion: "We will need to stage our own Testing" (*Graduation* 114). In contriving her own version of The Testing, Cia reflects on methods and scenarios used in the formal Testing to structure her assessment: "while I do not want to ask myself this, I have to wonder, if they do not pass, what the punishment for failure should be?" (*Graduation* 125). Cia determines for one case that the punishment for disloyalty is death (*Graduation* 142), and this constructs her Testing, which is conducted in the name of reform, as largely undisguisable from the processes she is attempting to change.

Cia continues to be manipulated by the governing powers to achieve their own agendas through methods that are as atrocious as what had come before. The resistance and Cia are successful in bringing down The Testing board by murdering them, rather than making their crimes public and seeking judicial justice. It is unclear at the close of the trilogy if the reforms to The Testing and the University offer real alternatives or are merely a watered-down version of what had come before. This ambiguity is best illustrated in the decision of what to do with the many failed candidates trapped in testing facilitates: the failed Testing candidates and University students are rescued from their scientific testing, but their memories of the experimentations are erased, which Cia "cannot disagree" with (*Graduation* 369). The Testing is dismantled in favour of a vaguely described "new selection system for the University" with no description of how the "new" system will be different from the last (*Graduation* 369).

Although Cia uses sousveillance to balance the scales of power and gather her own data on the organizational observers, Cia's resistance does not offer a substantial alternative to what had come before. As in Card's narrative, it is Cia's ability to undertake resistance using sousveillance, regardless of its success, that is significant. In an examination of surveillance in Collins' *The Hunger Games*, Kerry Mallan finds that although the quality of Katniss's rebellion is debatable, it invites scepticism about surveillance in our lives and "foster[s] awareness of ethical dilemmas, as well as the consequences of immoral or unjust human actions" (15). Similar to Katniss, in Bean's and Cia's rebellions social orders remain unchanged but the "capacity for transformation, at least at the individual level" is highlighted (Mallan 15). *The Testing* presents a clear moral imperative that formulates the option of being a bystander to corruption as enabling that corruption, and it is Cia's responsibility and moral obligation to be an active political citizen and resist corrupt structures.

The Spire School's Successful Rebellion

S. J. Kincaid's *Insignia* trilogy deviates significantly from Card's and Charbonneau's dystopias in demonstrating a successful youth rebellion that reforms not only the protagonists' school space, but all of society. *Insignia* takes place in a future in which Earth's natural resources have been nearly depleted and a Third World War is fought over natural resources in the solar system. An Indo-American Alliance fights against a Russo-Chinese Alliance for stellar resources in space. The interstellar war is fought by youth-piloted drones, and the protagonist, Tom, is taught in his high school that the conflict is more civilized than the previous two World Wars in avoiding "debilitating injuries, human deaths, disruption of infrastructure, and environmental contamination" (*Insignia* 9). The twelve most powerful global corporations, the Coalition of

Multinationals, are split between the two alliances and fund the conflict. The corporations sell the technology with which the war is fought to the alliances and the young drone pilots must find corporate sponsorship to receive and maintain their position. The space conflicts are broadcast for civilians to watch; these viewers cheer for their pilots much as a sports fan would for his or her home team. The broadcasts turn the young pilots into global celebrities, whose merchandise, which is also manufactured and sold by the corporations, is rapidly consumed by civilians to display support of their favourite pilots. Elliot Ramirez, for example, is a top-performing combatant who, alongside military accolades, has won corporate awards such as "Taco Bell Teen Hero Award" and the "*Teen People's* Young Heartthrob of the Year" (*Insignia* 87).

The Indo-American Alliance monitors and recruits youth who demonstrate killer instincts and extraordinary virtual reality (VR) gaming skills and train them for the Intrasolar Forces at the Pentagonal Spire—an elite military academy. The academy provides students the typical high school curriculum (math, science, history, literature, and calisthenics) paired with military subjects such as strategic theory, applied battle simulations, tactics, and military history. Students of the Spire aspire to become combatants (those who pilot battle drones), and they must excel in their courses at school (civilian and military) to attract corporate sponsors. Because of the global fame and fortune graduates of the Pentagonal Spire acquire, many youths aspire to attend the academy. Like Card's Battle School and Charbonneau's University, the Pentagonal Spire reimagines the school space in the elite and auspicious light that Victorian public schools transmitted. Far from offering a mundane and ordinary experience, the Pentagonal Spire, like Card and Charbonneau's school spaces, is a space reserved for the elite, constructing the space as special in its exclusivity and the students as special in being deemed worthy of attending.

Corporate Governance

The *Insignia* trilogy differs from the two other dystopias examined in that corporate economy has taken the place, power, and authority of the state. *Insignia* participates in what Tom Moylan labels the "dystopian [literary] turn" at the end of the twentieth century, and that has continued into the new millennium, of the authoritarian state giving way to the "more pervasive tyranny of the corporation" (135). The lives of dystopian characters are still observed and controlled through the surveillance of organizational observers, but individuals are also "reified, exploited, and commodified" by the rule of corporations (136). Given neoliberalism's dominance in the 1990s and onwards, Moylan finds this dystopian shift unsurprising and as having taken place as the "narrative step from state to economy as the motor of society can be read . . . as a symptomatic echo of neoliberal hegemony" (140). Moylan argues that neoliberal thinkers' claims that interference from the state will constrain market growth conceals the "contradictory secret" of neoliberalism: economic sustainability is not a matter of eliminating the state, but of "restricting its activities to those that aid capital and not society" (141).

In the *Insignia* trilogy, the activities of the state have been restricted as the locus of dominant power has shifted from state to corporations, and corporate boards, rather than government cabinets or battle rooms, determine global policies. *Insignia*, like other dystopias (and the lethal violence novels as well) that contain the hegemonic shift from state to economy, communicates anxieties regarding the consequences of marginalizing socially responsible states for a hegemonic dominance fully concerned and driven by selfish interests. The corporations in *Insignia* consider individuals valuable either as customers to sell products to, or as products themselves to be manipulated or discarded according to the corporations' needs. It is uncovered by youth/students that the corporations continue to fund war projects not in the pursuit of peace

but as a sustained plan for an ongoing war that increases profit margins through the alliances' continued patronage of their wartime commodities.

Tom Raines, the skinny, short, and acne-covered teenaged protagonist of the trilogy, eagerly accepts his invitation to the Spire because of his desire to be important and special. Initially, Tom is thought to have little to distinguish himself for success in a global economy. Tom is told by his high school teacher that he will never find work in a globalized economy because of his inability to excel in the stereotypical school space. Tom excels in virtual reality games; however, his teacher reminds him:

> You're competing in a global economy. One out of three Americans is unemployed. You need an education to be an engineer, a programmer, or anything of use to the defence industry. You need an education to be an accountant or a lawyer, and you need connections to go into government or corporate work. Who do you think would hire a young man like you when there are so many high-achieving candidates out there who are desperate for work? (*Insignia* 18)

Told he has nothing to offer a global economy nor anything to distinguish himself in global job competitions (his teacher asks: "what are you good for?" [*Insignia* 31]), Tom is left feeling worthless.

Agents of the corporations and the Intrasolar Forces monitor potential students through covert surveillance techniques, which in Tom's case involves their observing his online VR game play. Tom is recruited for the very skills his high school teacher had denigrated as making him useless to the global market, his gaming skills, and this initially construes Tom's story as a modern-day fairy tale for gamers. Tom is easily seduced into accepting the invitation to the Spire

school, which leads him to feel special and exceptional. Tom's father is anti-military, anti-capitalist, and correctly apprehends that the corporations,

> . . . use taxpayer-funded militaries to fight their private skirmishes, and then they sell the public on paying for it by donning the mantle of patriotism. This is all just a big fight between members of the Coalition to see who will become the richest CEO in the solar system! (*Insignia* 31)

His father warns Tom that students of the Spire are "just another piece of equipment" (*Insignia* 31). Tom's father comprehends what has been present throughout the school story subgenre: students are products, and schools mould students according to the values of their hegemonic society. Even knowing there is truth in his father's warning, Tom eagerly accepts the opportunity to attend the Spire because "[h]e'd give up anything to be important" (*Insignia* 49). As in Card's and Charbonneau's narratives, students are initially willing to overlook the signs of the institutions' oppressive natures, including the pervasive surveillance utilized in recruitment, for the chance to be included in the elite educational space. Characters in all three YA dystopian school stories have been socialized by their institutions' propaganda to believe acceptance to the schools determines students' worth.

The Control of Neural Processors

The Spire school, housed in what was once the Pentagon, is a panopticon because of its architecture (imbedded with surveillance devices) and the neural processors all students carry: "a very sophisticated computer that interacts directly with your brain" (*Insignia* 40). The Obsidian Corporation, the only corporation not aligned with a singular alliance and that does not sponsor combatants, manufactures and sells the neural processors to both alliances. The neural processors

are imperative to the war in that the combat drones can only be accessed by interfacing with them. Within the school space, the neural processors interface with the technological devices in the building to empower the Spire staff's constant observation of student behaviour and provides adult control of the students' five senses. In a society governed completely by economics, the Spire school acts as a literal factory that produces particular student-products dictated by the needs of corporations. The insertion of the neural processors transforms students into actual pieces of equipment to be used by both sides of the alliances and the corporations, and the Spire functions as the space that creates and fine-tunes the product before they are launched into "adult" society.

Students receive all information through their processors. The pedagogical structures of the Spire as enacted by the neural processors closely resemble Giroux's description of the neoliberal "disimagination machine that spews out stories in calculating a disdain for community, public values, public life, and democracy" (*Violence* 17). Giroux posits that "elitist forces" are "distracting, miseducating, and deterring the public from acting in its own interests" (*Violence* 19) through pedagogy that is synonymous with teaching as "drudgery of memorization, rote learning, and harsh disciplinary practices" (*Violence* 177). Spire students download and process course material through their neural processors while they sleep and are tested during class time to gauge whether the downloads have been processed correctly. Learning is rote, and critical thinking, or any engagement with material, is completely absent. Spire students are *tabula rasa* who passively accept the information written upon their neural processors. Students download and understand material in ways the Intrasolar Forces approves, which implicates adult power over youth students in directly moulding students' knowledge and beliefs.

Similar to how staff at Card's Battle School use technology to implicate their power over students' lives in significant ways such as controlling whether students have oxygen to breathe, Spire staff control students' five senses, which grants teachers immense power in their ability to manipulate students' experiences in the school space. In the second book of Kincaid's trilogy, *Vortex*, the processors of Tom and his second-year "Middle" classmates are upgraded, and this reveals sections of the Spire previously hidden from their view. Students were unaware that the Spire staff could conceal sections of the school from them through the manipulation of their sight, and the upgrade reveals the extent to which the processors control students' movements in the space: students cannot enter spaces that they are unable to perceive exist.

Adult control over student bodies through their senses is significantly demonstrated in the character of Yuri, a Russian student suspected to be a spy for the Russo-Chinese Alliance, but admitted by the Intrasolar Forces in order to appease corporate donors because of Yuri's family connections. The academy is anxious Yuri could relay information learned at the Spire to the Russo-Chinese Alliance, and faculty severely limit and manipulate what Yuri sees and hears by scrambling sensory information through his neural processor (*Insignia* 66). Yuri's processor "shuts him down" during classes, provides his peers aliases instead of their real names, disguises students' appearances, and modifies any potentially dangerous conversations into gibberish (*Insignia* 66). Yuri is unable to comprehend that his vision, hearing, and perception of information is manipulated, and he is programmed through the neural processor not to notice the hours lost when his brain is "shut down."

The processors also allow Spire staff control over student bodies' growth by the processors' manipulation of genes and hormones so that specific bodily traits can thrive in order to build the ideal combatant; for example, "the processor pretty much shuts off anything it deems

extraneous like the function of hair follicles on your face when you have to be clean-shaven for the military" (*Insignia* 81). Students undergo dramatic growth spurts immediately following the installation of their neural processors because staff influence hGH levels so that students experience five years of growth over a span of days (*Insignia* 141). Since the Golden Age of school stories, students have been presented as the product of their schools, and this was made explicit in lethal violence novels when teachers admitted to feeling responsible to their communities to produce particular types of graduates. In Kincaid's series, moulding the student-product is intensified as puberty is sped up so that students reach their optimal physical potential quickly, and by tampering with students' hormones staff can control the height, weight, and appearance of student bodies to best serve the needs of the Intrasolar Forces. Attractive combatants are easier for corporations to advertise, just as Fredric Jameson notes globalization turns commodity production into a cultural phenomenon in which "you buy the product fully as much for its *image* as for its *immediate use*" ("Globalization" 53, emphasis added). All students are controlled to be physically imposing and attractive to entice the sponsorship of corporations, who will have less troubling selling good-looking combatants to the masses than they could with naturally aging and acne-riddled pubescent teenagers.

Control of students' five senses and the growth of their bodies demonstrates the extent to which adults, both the staff of the Spire and the corporations, manipulate students' movement, interactions, and perception of their experiences within the school space. Although students understand the function of the processors, they are unsuspicious and even welcoming of the tampering because of their desire to be considered special and important. Students are convinced by the rhetoric of the corporations that the neural processors make students the best versions of themselves (*Insignia* 42), and though the neural processors take away agency, students are

seduced by the belief that the computers make them "better" and able to "do anything" (*Catalyst* 16). Students desire to be made into a profitable product because their self-worth is inextricably linked with becoming a combatant, which entails commodification in order to be purchased and sold in the economy of the Third World War.

Obsidian Corp, which manufactures and distributes the neural processors to the two alliances, covertly installs processors into a vast majority of the global population. Installed in these processors are obedience programs that instil complete loyalty to the Obsidian corporation, as well as subroutines that force bodies to follow the laws of their nations that are determined by corporations. Also included are trojan programs that provide Obsidian the power to turn off brain function on command. Tom uncovers the trojan program is installed so that those "classified as expendable—the weak, the elderly, the deficient" could be culled to solve the problem of "too many people and too few resources" (350). The school space functions as a testing ground for the neural processors, and once perfected, Obsidian corporation puts plans into motion to exercise the discipline of the Spire over the entire globe.

Tom and Company's Successful Sousveillance Rebellion

The neural processors make uncovering the true intentions of Obsidian Corp extremely difficult, and the possibility of resistance or rebellion even more remote. Yet, even with this high rate of difficulty, Tom and his peers stage the most successful rebellion of the texts examined in this chapter. Their rebellion is somewhat narratively complex: Tom uncovers Obsidian Corps' true intentions for the neural processors (committing genocide of those deemed invaluable and unprofitable), which facilitates an existential crisis for Tom in which

> [h]e refused to believe the sole reason for existence was the perpetuation of existence at any cost. There had to be a reason for it all . . . a point to living in the first place. A better future had to be possible. (*Catalyst* 214)

To achieve a better future, a team of students and teachers from the Spire work together with youth combatants from the Russo-Chinese Alliance to distribute a message to everyone installed with a neural processor. The message makes users aware of the processors' existence and opens access to several corporations' confidential files and data from their surveillance. The combatant rebels request the help of civilians in recoding the processors to eliminate the obedience subroutine. A new code is invented through the collaboration of countless individuals across the globe, and, once installed, it overrides the obedience subroutine and allows members from both alliances to destroy Obsidian's headquarters. Because of the attack, Obsidian loses control of the processor technology and people across around the world are empowered by the ability to self-program their own neural processors. A utopia springs forth as knowledge is freely disseminated and the corporations are boycotted.

Insignia presents a collective rebellion (unlike Bean's largely individual resistance) that does not employ methods in league with the ruling governing structures (as in Charbonneau's trilogy) and offers a substantial alternative to current oppressive structures. The rebellion is successful because it is able to break down barriers the global corporations construct by uniting youth and adults from the Indo-American and the Russo-Chinese alliances and schools into a collective. Significantly, the Spire is an important ally to the resistance, as Tom and his team are able to reappropriate the school space and its resources to fuel their rebellion. Students had previously been dissuaded by the competitive impulses informed by the economy of winners and losers from creating communities concerned with the public good. While the school space under

the control of the corporations had oppressed students, the rebellion is not specifically against the school space, but rather reorganizes the school to utilize the potentially powerful community within who are together capable of engaging in, and positivity influencing, political structures.

Jameson argues that social cohesion, "though not enough in [itself], [is] necessarily the indispensable precondition for any effective long-lasting political struggle" ("Globalization" 68). Jameson terms this social cohesion "combination" and argues that the numerous labour movements across the globe provide real world "examples of the forging of new forms of solidarity in active political work" ("Globalization" 68). Moylan furthers Jameson's ideas and argues that it is "collective action that achieves a unity-in-diversity capable of fighting simultaneously on economic, political, and cultural terrains" (142). However, Moylan contends that such collective action must engage dominant hegemonic structures on the street to "move forward to restructure society in the interest of its people and not of the corporations draining its lifeblood" (143). Kincaid's global resistance of the dominant hegemony engages systematically in interrupting the corporations' power through methods of sousveillance and reflectionism (the use of technology to mirror and confront bureaucratic organizations), and on the ground level with the masses rebuilding society without the aid, input, or resources of corporations.

The rebel faction situated in the Spire school is able to conduct its activities stealthily by hacking the Spire's computers not to recognize the neural processors of the rebels. Just as the Spire controlled and manipulated the senses of the students, the rebel group uses the same technology to "hide within plain sight" as their hack makes them invisible to those outside the rebellion. The rebels block themselves from the surveilling gaze of the Spire and take control of the data collected on their movements and actions by interfering with the surveillance technology. The group is able to appropriate the school space into a locus of rebellion and

liberate themselves from the oppressive gaze by reformulating the tools that had once oppressed them.

The rebels' tactic of hacking the neural processors of the masses and providing access to several corporations' confidential documents is a form of reflectionism in that they "appropriate tools of social controllers and resituat[e] these tools in a disorienting manner" by "holding a mirror to the establishment" with the intention of increasing "the equality between surveiller and the person being surveilled" (Mann et al. 333). Alongside confidential documents, individuals are provided with the personalized data the corporations had gathered on them through surveillance, including those whom Obsidian had catalogued for genocide. The redistribution of information, that has originated from a rebellion housed in a school space, increases the equality between the corporations and those they surveilled, and the power of the corporations is decreased in the surveilled rejecting the plans of the surveillers.

The school space of the Spire functions as the centre of the global resistance and is transformed into a site of collective resistance by the united rebellions of its students. The rebellion of the Spire students results in radically transforming the neoliberal capitalist power structures of global society. The transformation is made possible by opening information that had been controlled by the corporations and taught only at elite schools (like the Spire) to be freely accessible to all. Gordon Lafer argues that neoliberal corporate culture protects itself from the masses by "lowering everybody's expectations of what we have a right to demand as citizens," and expectations are lowered by dismantling public education and lowering the standard of education people receive (Lafer qtd. in Parramore). The corporations in Kincaid's series lowered citizens' expectations by strictly controlling the transmission of information and decreasing the standards of education the masses receive. Newly armed with knowledge acquired by

sousveillance, and that was initiated by the Spire students, the masses choose to boycott the corporations and this destroys the continued power and control of the corporations over the masses. Knowledge is no longer controlled by corporate powers, or contained within corporate-approved schools, and because of the redistribution of knowledge "the world [is] transformed" (*Catalyst* 383). A "worldwide backlash" ensues and the "repressed hostility toward the rest of the ruling class boiled up and consumed the world" (*Catalyst* 383-4). The neoliberal society which had built and ensured the governing elites' power now aids in their downfall:

> [N]o one would sell them anything; their money was worthless. No one would guard their houses. People boycotted giving them aid and comfort and assistance that came from an entire society of human beings. . . . They were exiles amid the society they'd tried to subjugate. (*Catalyst* 384)

The elites are shut out from the world market, and their power is taken from them in the free distribution of knowledge and their exclusion from acquiring capital. The boycott is an extension of global sousveillance in that by acquiring more knowledge individuals are empowered to neutralize surveillance of themselves by making meaningful choices in how they use their resources, which was the means with which the corporations sustained their disciplinary and oppressive surveillance.

Millions of individuals appropriate the once oppressive neural devices to transform society into a utopia, and the notion of "school" and "education" are redefined to embody the self-directed and autonomous education models that Alec Waugh dreamt of in Chapter Two. The neural processors link the minds to the internet, which makes every form of information accessible to all, and equal access to knowledge that had once been controlled and limited by the corporations transforms global society:

> Knowledge began to disseminate everywhere. It wasn't like the downloads Tom and his friends received every day in the Spire, because they were all optional, all in public databases for people who were interested in learning new languages, new skills. The effect was incredible. People who'd never learned to read, who'd never been educated, could now make up for years of missed schooling with a few downloads. New breakthroughs followed. (*Catalyst* 393)

The democratization of knowledge creates a golden age of humanity called "the singularity," in which "all the latent genius of humanity" is unlocked and used in a way that is absent of "the old, entrenched power players" (*Catalyst* 394). The installed processors allow for sousveillance to continue going forward, as governments remain observable to those they serve and this enables citizens to continually monitor the uses of state power. The utopia is achieved through methods of sousveillance creating equality between the governed and the governors, and information of any kind remains open to all instead of sequestered to an elite few who use the disparity to manipulate and control.

Kincaid constructs a world in which youth are able to make lasting changes; indeed, they transform their world into a utopia through collective action and resistance. For Kincaid, the school space of the Spire is a space of both despair and hope: it functioned as the agent of control for the governing elite and transformed young students into equipment easily manipulated for the benefit of the elite, but through the subversions of students and staff, the community that the Spire brought together stages a collective movement and demonstrates the power of youth who engage in their societies.

Conclusion

In each dystopian society in these YA school stories, the school space is constructed as a locus of corrupt government and neoliberal corporate control. The hegemonic society of each, like the school stories discussed throughout this dissertation, relies heavily on the graduates produced by each school space to sustain corrupt structures, and surveillance is the most prevalent form of discipline utilized to transform students into docile and obedient graduates. Although the authors present rebellions with varying degrees of effectiveness, each narrative communicates the importance of youth characters acting as political agents and citizens. Rather than accept the power disparity between adults and youth perpetrated by their school spaces, every protagonist comes to see it as his or her responsibility to at least *attempt* reform, for to do nothing would mean participating in and perpetuating the systems which oppressed them and others.

The social structures in the YA dystopian school stories are similar to those found in lethal violence school stories: highly competitive student relationships are encouraged by the school's disciplinary structures that groom competitive graduates to perpetuate neoliberal values into their adult lives. Put differently, the lethal violence school stories make apparent the ways in which contemporary North American schools already function in many ways like the imagined schools of the dystopian novel—as noted at the beginning of this chapter, Westerfeld compares dystopian literature to the contemporary lived experience of North American high schools. The lethal violence school stories represent their dystopian-like schools as plagued with largely "youth problems," and do not implicate larger systemic structures' contributions to producing such oppressive and aggressive spaces. Conversely, dystopian school stories provide a broader examination of the macrocosms that produce the microcosm of the schools and depict the ruling powers' manipulation of students through pedagogy, discipline, surveillance and so forth as

essential in the sustainment of corrupt structures. The problems characters face are not depicted as exclusively "youth problems," but public issues that impact the whole of society. These school stories situate school spaces within the important intersection of pedagogy and politics, immerse their characters within the intersection, and politicize their rebellions and resistances. The texts show schools to be political spaces, and that it is students' responsibilities to intervene in oppressive school structures, for actively engaging in the structures of a school space spills over to the political practice of larger society.

The individual rebellions of the lethal violence characters, Bean, and Cia fail to achieve lasting and wide-reaching reforms, whereas the collective rebellion of the Spire students is successful in dramatically altering society from the top (the corporations) down (to the "masses"). Giroux is inspired by the collective resistance of the March for Our Lives movement, because it is "[e]ngaged in a form of productive unsettling and collective dissent, they are fighting back, holding power accountable and giving birth to a vibrant form of political struggle" ("Killing Children"). Collective resistance is largely absent in the lethal violence school stories, is experimented with in Card and Charbonneau's dystopian school stories, and is utilized successfully by Kincaid's Spire students. The school space is a community, a characteristic that Golden Age public-school stories valorized, and the youth-authored school stories tried to reform. School communities can be a strong social force for reform if aggressive and competitive relationships are replaced with a sense of public good and responsibility. The following chapter examines J. K. Rowling's *Harry Potter* series, the role of collective rebellion, and explores how youth readers have appropriated the texts to give narrative structure to their own collective resistances.

Chapter Six

Managed Mischief:

Harry Potter's Conservative Rule-Breaking Inspiring Radical Social Change

> "You think kids raised on *Harry Potter* and *Hunger Games* are going to give up?? [sic] Silly Adults."
>
> —@Savedbythepage

J. K. Rowling could easily be considered the foretold "writer of genius" P. W. Musgrave prophesied to take the school story subgenre and remake it with her *Harry Potter* series (Musgrave 240). Musgrave did not call for a revolutionary writer, but dreamt of authors similar to Talbot Baines Reed who remade the school story subgenre with stories that were "more subtle in characterisation, more complex in plot and less overtly moralistic" (126), or like Rudyard Kipling's *Stalky and Co*. which did not "overtly moralis[e]" (172), but maintained a didactic aim (171). Musgrave dreamt of moral subtlety that made the conventional socialization of fictional students both more covert and entertaining for readers. The socialization of fictional students and readers remained the aim in these "writers of genius's" works, but they are held as innovators by Musgrave because of their didactic subtlety. Rowling's oeuvre can easily be grouped with that of Reed and Kipling because of *Harry Potter*'s innovations in covert didacticism while still aligning with and perpetuating values established in Victorian public-school stories. The immense popularity of Rowling's series has ignited the smouldering embers of British public-school stories, as well as the values these stories imbued, though with significant differences in Rowling's focus on social justice and Hogwarts' students' political responsibilities.

The quantity of new school stories following *Harry Potter* has not come close to the proliferation of school story publications of the Victorian and Edwardian periods, but the excitement with which readers have approached Hogwarts, the school in *Harry Potter*, has moved the subgenre more into the forefront of popular culture than it has been for decades. The expansion of the series' canon has made Hogwarts a transmedia fixture and pushed a fictional boarding school space into popular culture: all seven books in the *Harry Potter* series have remained on many bestseller lists consistently for twenty years; the eight film adaptions of the series regularly dominated the box-office and, combined, grossed 6.5 billion dollars (Close); in July of 2011, Rowling launched the website *Pottermore*, which supplies subscribers news, articles, interactive reading experiences, and new or unreleased writings by Rowling that expand the canon; Hogwarts took to the stage in July 2016 with *The Cursed Child* and has been selling out shows since its opening; and the creation of *Harry Potter* theme parks in the United States and Britain attract hundreds of thousands of tourists who are eager to enter into physical manifestations of the narrative, especially that of Hogwarts. Rowling has singlehandedly managed to remake the school story subgenre by returning the school space to its historical and traditional Victorian roots through the construction of an idealized school space that is special, exclusive, and, at least for Harry, better than home.

Young British witches and wizards attend Hogwarts to be socialized as future adult citizens who will protect and uphold the values of their magical community, much like their Muggle (non-magical) public-school story ancestors. Although much time is spent in Potions and Charms classes, Hogwarts' primary directive, much as in Rugby before it, is to provide students a moral education that develops character traits of bravery, selflessness, loyalty, obedience, and devotion to their school and wizardry community. Rowling expands the moral education of the

Victorian public-school space to include lessons on active civic engagement that cast issues of social justice as the responsibility of every citizen. Essential to the socialization of Hogwarts' students and their civic preparation is rule-breaking. Just as Thomas Hughes's Tom Brown learns to purge his selfish desires in order to properly govern and to respect the authority of morally just leaders by experimenting with the boundaries of authority, Harry receives the majority of his moral education and character formation by pushing against, and breaking, school rules.

Harry's and his friends' rule-breaking are imperative to their moral education regarding "The Law," or, in other terms, doing what is morally right. Elizabeth Galway argues that rule-breaking in school stories serves as the students' means of learning to distinguish between "authority which is just and that which is abused" (81), and Bill McCarron notes that the ultimate outcome of rule-breaking is that protagonists learn to respect authority which is "faithfully practiced [and] generates a shared power, not one that is arbitrarily imposed" (McCarron 9). Harry's and his peers' rule-breaking functions as safe rebellions within the school space in that it tests the boundaries of power and authority before "becoming fully appreciative of, and participating in, the value system of their [the students'] institutions, rather than a serious attempt to challenge or reform this system" (Galway 82). Through rule-breaking, Harry is made fully appreciative and supportive of the morally just systems modelled for him at Hogwarts under the leadership of Headmaster Dumbledore, and this, in turn, prepares Harry for his rebellion against Lord Voldemort.

Harry Potter revives and extends Victorian public-school conventions, signalling both a return to Victorian values and a revision of them. Hogwarts, in alignment with its public-school story ancestors, affords physical and symbolic space for student rebellions that are imperative to students' moral education and that teach students to respect, obey, and *defend* morally just

leaders and government. The defence of "fair" governments—for the British government was always depicted as fair in Victorian school stories—was always implied in Victorian public-school stories, especially in the genre's romanization of war. In Golden Age school stories, colonialization and war took graduates *outside* of Britain to transplant their assumed superior governing systems into colonized lands. Fictional students and graduates in Victorian and Edwardian public-school stories *never* rebelled against the British State. In contrast, Rowling's characters defend social justice *inside* Britain and even resist their own government when it is infiltrated and corrupted by Lord Voldemort. This is an innovative addition to include a domestic threat; however, Harry and his companions' rebellions against Lord Voldemort and his Death Eaters (the name for Voldemort's followers) are still conservative rebellions in that they seek to restore previous structures rather than remake or reform them.

Rebecca Skulnik and Jesse Goodnow argue that *Harry Potter* teaches readers that "one can become a civic leader without having to reconstruct the institution's hegemonic structure" (272), and not only does Harry leave hegemonic structures intact but his "rebellions" are actually in their defence. In the last book of Rowling's series, *The Deathly Hallows*, Voldemort's fascist regime grows at an alarming rate, and Harry and his allies cling to the belief that Hogwarts and the wizarding world can be restored to what they once were. Sarah K. Cantrell states that Harry and others have internalized the space of Hogwarts that they knew under Dumbledore's leadership and carry they "those spaces with them as they journey towards danger and death" (208). In other terms, Harry and his allies have internalized their school space and carry the space with them in their fight against Voldemort in the belief that the past and its values can be restored through their subversions of corrupt structures.

In this chapter, I argue that *Harry Potter* functions as both an extension of the conservative nature of the Golden Age public-school story that includes a perpetuation of restrictive conceptions of race, gender, and sexuality, and expands upon its Golden Age predecessors by integrating youth characters into political life. First, I establish that the "specialness" of Hogwarts and its sustained desirability to students is a return of the Victorian privileged space of education, and the sense of belonging to the school that is facilitated by the space's organizational structures bolsters students' self-worth and fosters loyalty to the space and its ideologies. Headmaster Albus Dumbledore is the orchestrator of Hogwarts' organizational and disciplinary structures, and in his orchestration, he becomes the embodiment of the space and its values; when students grow more obedient to the space because it provides them a sense of belonging that fortifies their self-worth, they grow in obedience to Dumbledore as well.

The second section engages with Hogwarts' more insidious sustainment of Victorian public-school values and explores several scholars' rejections of the claim that Rowling's fictional world is a place of multiculturalism and global equality. Rather than a space of equality, Rowling's world in actuality perpetuates restrictive nineteenth-century conceptions of gender, sexuality, race, and ethnicity. The Victorian nature of Hogwarts's values thus situates the characters' rebellions, that are in defence of these outdated ideologies, as conservative.

I next analyze the rule-breaking of Hogwarts' students. Incidents of rule-breaking teach students characters and readers it is both their right and responsibility to be active citizens and to rebel against unjust systems. Lastly, while the rebellion in *Harry Potter* is largely conservative in its attempt to restore previous governing systems, I proceed to examine the influence of the series on the March for Our Lives campaign, a radical, "real-world," youth-led political movement that seeks fundamental change in governmental policies. In that movement, youth

organizers and participants demonstrate they have internalized Rowling's lesson that it is their right and responsibility to be active political citizens.

Civic Education at Hogwarts: Constructing the Ideal

The Attractive Novelty of Hogwarts

The 1870 Forster's Educational Act, together with the 1880 and 1891 Educational Acts, set the foundation in Britain for a national system of compulsory and free education that is still utilized today. The outcome of these Educational Acts began to take full effect in the early twentieth century, which saw more children attending school regularly and made the experience of schooling less dominated by the elite. Rosemary Auchmuty considers the Golden Age school story decline as a consequence of the increased numbers of British children more consistently attending school, which resulted in the school space, in books and reality, no longer being considered "special, wonderful, inspiring lasting loyalty and affection, but rather as normal, mundane often tedious, and sometimes an ordeal to be got through as quickly and as best one can" (Auchmuty "School Stories"). The shift in perception is evident in many of the texts examined in this dissertation, and throughout the subgenre, as characters often begrudgingly accept school attendance as an experience they must get through, not one they are privileged to experience. Similar to Orson Scott Card's, Joelle Charbonneau's, and S. J Kincaid's YA dystopian school spaces, Rowling's Hogwarts resurrects the representation of a school space that is elite in that only witches and wizards can attend and is made a desirable place in that its exclusivity labels students as extraordinary. Unlike the YA dystopian school spaces, however,

Hogwarts meets and sometimes exceeds students' expectations and remains a desirable space throughout the series.

Auchmuty ascribes *Harry Potter*'s success to British readers' familiarity with public-school settings that are deeply entrenched in British culture, so much so that they are recognizable even to those who have never attended public schools. While it is true that the space and structure of Hogwarts is recognizable to those familiar with the school story subgenre or the public-school system, this argument does little to explain the success of *Harry Potter* outside of Britain, especially in Canada and the United States where the structures of British public schools are not as commonly known. Hogwarts may attract some readers because the familiarity provides a level of comfort, but it may as well be the *novelty* of public school that makes Hogwarts appealing to many Britons and most North Americans. Although the public-school ethos is deeply entrenched in British culture, only a privileged minority attend public schools, making this an elite experience extremely different from that of most British students. The public-school ["private school"] setting is even rarer in Canada and the United States, as a public ["private"] or boarding school is not as ingrained in the cultures. Characters' experiences at Hogwarts are vastly different from the lived school experience of many readers, and it is this difference from the perceived mundane nature of schools that may contribute to Hogwarts' ability to captivate the prolonged attention of readers. However, the public-school setting of *Harry Potter* can be only one element of Hogwarts' appeal, as countless other British, and to a lesser extent Canadian and American, titles have employed the public-school or boarding school setting but have not attracted the same attention from readers that *Harry Potter* has sustained for over twenty years.

The inclusion of magic could be another argument for *Harry Potter*'s success; however, a public school that educates wizards and witches also is not new terrain. *Harry Potter* has been compared alongside texts similarly concerned with magical education, such as Jill Murphy's *Worst Witch* series (1974-2013), Diana Wynne Jones's *Witch Week* (1982), Anthony Horowitz's *Groosham Grange* (1988), and Jane Yolen's *Wizard's Hall* (1991).[64] Each example is set at a magical British public school (*Witch Week* being the exception, as it is set at a day school), and while each has been commercially successful, none have reached the height and breadth of *Harry Potter*'s fame and success. The significant difference between these texts and *Harry Potter* is the representation of the architectural school spaces and their ability to maintain a sense of prestige throughout their narratives. The magical school spaces are, at best, begrudgingly attended by fictional students, and characters are in perpetual conflict with the disciplinary structures of the space. Jones's Larwood House is a divided school in which witches are hunted by students and teachers alike; Horowitz's Groosham Grange teaches dark magic, and protagonist David spends much of the novel trying to escape; Murphy's Miss Cackle's Academy looks like a prison (Murphy 1), and protagonist Mildred Hubble struggles to be accepted by her peers and is proclaimed the "worst witch in the entire school" (Murphy 43), by her Headmistress; and Yolen's protagonist Henry "had never wanted to be a wizard" (1), but is quickly sent by his mother without his consent to Wizard's Hall after "he mentioned wizardry to his dear ma. He didn't mean it. Not really. It was just a passing thought" (2). While there is conflict within the

[64] For more detailed comparisons on *Harry Potter* and British school stories concerned with magical education see Pat Pinsent's chapter, "The Education of a Wizard: *Harry Potter* and his Predecessors" (2002); Alice Mill's article, "Archetypes and the Unconscious in *Harry Potter* and Diana Wynne Jones's *Fire and Hemlock* and *Dogsbody*" (2003); Lisa Hopkins's chapter, "Harry Potter and the Acquisition of Knowledge" (2003); and Maria Nikolajeva's article, "*Harry Potter* and the Secrets of Children's Literature" (2009).

walls of Hogwarts, especially between members of rival houses, students generally love their school and the focalization from Harry's perspective preserves early expectations of Hogwarts' specialness throughout the series; unlike other magical protagonists, Hogwarts is always a space that Harry *wants* to inhabit.

One form of evidence of Hogwarts' difference from its magical peers can be gleaned in authors' descriptions of their school spaces. As discussed in Chapter One, common in Golden Age school stories were multiple and detailed descriptive passages of the architectural school space that often read like adoring odes and emphasized the "specialness of these places . . . a sense of wonderful novelty and possibility" (Steege 145). The physical descriptions of Hogwarts are similar to the lovingly described school spaces of the Golden Age and differ from the ominous images that have become more common in school stories published since the Golden Age. The table below shows a side-by-side comparison of the first descriptions of school spaces in Thomas Hughes's *Tom Brown*, Jill Murphy's *The Worst Witch*, Anthony Horowitz's *Groosham Grange*, and Rowling's *Philosopher's Stone* to emphasize the difference:

From *Tom Brown*:	From *The Worst Witch:*	From *Groosham Grange:*	From *Philosopher's Stone*:
Tom's heart beat quick as he passed the great school field or close, with its noble elms, in which several games at football were going on, and tried to take in at once the long line of grey buildings, beginning with the chapel, and ending with the School-house, the residence of the head-master, where the	Miss Cackle's Academy for Witches stood at the top of a high mountain surrounded by a pine forest. It looked *more like a prison than a school*, with its gloomy grey walls and turrets. . . . Everything about the school was dark and shadowy. (1, emphasis added)	It was a huge building, taller than it was wide; a *crazy* mixture of battlements, *barred windows*, soaring towers, grinning gargoyles, and *ugly* brick chimneys. (48, emphasis added)	The narrow path had opened suddenly on to the edge of a great black lake. Perched atop a high mountain on the side, its windows *sparkling* in the starry sky, was a *vast castle* with many turrets and towers . . . *Everyone was silent*, starring up at the *great castle* overhead. (1.83, emphasis added)

great flag was lazily waving from the highest round tower. And he [Tom] began already to be *proud of being a Rugby boy*. (89, emphasis added)			

In each example, the physical space of the schools is similar in its use of Victorian, medieval, and gothic architectural elements (turrets, towers, grey buildings), but students' affection and awe when seeing Rugby and Hogwarts is absent in the descriptions of Miss Cackle's Academy and Groosham Grange, which are rather characterized as menacing and threatening.[65] Through the many and detailed descriptions of Hogwarts the space enchants characters, and this initial description especially shows "new students that they have entered into an exclusive, exciting environment brimming with the potential both to absorb them utterly and to help them come into their own" (Steege 145). Indeed, Harry's unceasing affection for his school is even more Victorian in nature than that of his magical peers. Students such as Harry are happy to attend, believing that the wonder and exclusive novelty of the architectural space adds to their own worth.

Rowling constructs Hogwarts as a school that fictional students want to attend, and it is Hogwarts' ability to meet students' expectations of wonder and excitement that has captured the attention of readers. The tedious, mundane, and even dangerous school spaces of other magical

[65] For more on *Harry Potter*'s resemblance to Thomas Hughes's *Tom Brown's Schooldays* see Nicholas Tucker's article, "The Rise and Rise of *Harry Potter*" (1999); David K. Steege's chapter, "*Harry Potter*, *Tom Brown*, and the British School Story: Lost in Transit?" (2002); Karen Manners Smith's article, "Harry Potter's Schooldays: J. K. Rowling and the British Boarding School Novel" (2003); and Elizabeth A. Galway's article, "Reminders of Rugby in the Halls of Hogwarts: The Insidious Influence of the School Story Genre on the Works of J. K. Rowling" (2012).

school stories (and more broadly school stories of the last fifty years and especially true of the IRS picturebooks, lethal violence, and dystopian school stories discussed in this study) set the foundation for any rule-breaking committed by students as being done *against* the school space. In contrast, Hogwarts is a site that students, both characters and readers, desire, one which sets up characters' rule-breaking as in defence of the space to preserve, validate, and maintain the power structures which make up the space.

Sense of Belonging: The House System at Hogwarts

Hogwarts students' loyalty to the school is developed through disciplinary structures enabled by the architectural space and practices that foster a sense of belonging. Most of Hogwarts's disciplinary structures, such as the monitorial and prefect systems, are familiar public-school methods first implemented by Thomas Arnold at Rugby and that became familiar public-school story tropes with Hughes's *Tom Brown*. As well, as has been the case since its development in the Victorian period, the house system physically organizes the enclosed school space and student bodies' movement within it, directly influences student relationships, and creates an atmosphere of community crucial to the curation of devotion to the space.

Upon arrival at Hogwarts, first-year students participate in the Sorting Ceremony that divides the group into the four school houses. Professor McGonagall explains to Harry's first-year cohort:

> The Sorting is a very important ceremony because, while you are here, your house will be something like your family at Hogwarts. You will have classes with the rest of your house, sleep in your house dormitory and spend free time in your house common room. (1.85)

Chantel Lavoie explains that the importance of the yearly Sorting Ceremony is its uniting "the past, present, and future" of the school; as well, the "initiation and homecoming reinforces two types of loyalties—that which each individual owes to the school, and that which is owing to one's house. The Sorting Hat thus brings the students together and simultaneously sets them apart" (35). Lavoie's description of the Sorting Ceremony could be easily used to describe the organization of students into separate houses within public-school stories and of Card's organization of student characters into armies in the *Ender* series. *Harry Potter* participates in an early, and an often sustained, convention of student organization that creates a sense of belonging and loyalty to the school, enables adult teachers and administrators to control and monitor student movement within the space, and that manipulates how peer relationships are formed and continued. At Hogwarts, students are sorted by the enchanted Sorting Hat, which, when placed on first-year students' heads, decides the house they belong to based on the character traits they share with the houses' founders: the brave, daring, and chivalrous go to Gryffindor; the just, loyal, and patient to Hufflepuff; the wise and academic go to Ravenclaw; and the cunning and dark to Slytherin.

Harry is anxious as he waits for his turn to be sorted, fearful that he will not be placed: "What if he wasn't chosen at all? What if he just sat there with the hat on his eyes for ages, until Professor McGonagall jerked it off his head and said there had obviously been a mistake and he'd better get back on the train?" (1.90). Although not given the internal perspective of other students, visible signs of nervousness betray that they may also experience Harry's fear of not being chosen: everyone looks "terrified" when informed of the sorting (1.95), students "stumble" and "scuttle" out of line when their names are called (1.97), and Neville "fell over on his way to the stool" (1.98). The terror of being rejected by the school is indicative of its being a desirous

place for Harry and his peers; not to be chosen would signify that one is not "special" enough to belong in the exclusive space. The Sorting Ceremony validates the students' exceptionalities, their right to be in the exclusive space, and proves to students that they belong at the school, which begins to foster sentiments of loyalty and devotion as a result of their being chosen and claimed by the school.

Harry compounds his anxiety by worrying that if he is sorted it will be into the "wrong" house. Harry overhears that Slytherin has a propensity for producing dark wizards, and he is nervous at potentially being placed there. When the Sorting Hat sits upon his head Harry pleads, "Not Slytherin" (1.91). The Sorting Hat questions this request and cites Harry's potential to "be great" and Slytherin's ability to "help you on the way to greatness, no doubt about that" (1.91). Though Harry is placed in Gryffindor, where he *desired* to be placed, Harry worries the Sorting Hat's indecision discloses he does not actually belong in Gryffindor. Dumbledore allays Harry's fears with the explanation that it was Harry's *wanting* to be in Gryffindor which had the Sorting Hat place him there: "It is our choices, Harry, that show what we truly are, far more than our abilities" (2.253). It is Harry's actions and choices which earn him a place in Gryffindor or Slytherin, and Harry is motivated by the heroic character traits assigned to Gryffindor in his decision-making, which causes Harry to foster those traits in himself to earn membership to his desired house. The same could be assumed of other students who believe the Sorting Hat has placed them where they belong based on their character traits, which constructs the sorting as a revelation to students of their "true selves." Students act in accordance to the character traits of their house, showing the house system as imperative to the character formation of students as they foster specific character traits in order to prove their house membership. This is similar to student characters in Golden Age public-school stories taking on character traits of bravery,

loyalty, and obedience in order to "fit" within their houses, or to Arnold Lunn's and Alec Waugh's arguments that devious behaviours such as cribbing, smoking, swearing are fostered within school houses because of the house system creating a "mob mentality" that normalizes corrupt behaviours. In all cases, the house systems are imperative to characters' character formations and development as either clean living, or corrupt, adults.

The house system controls students' movements throughout the buildings of Hogwarts and highly influences the formation of relationships. Four long tables divide the student body into their houses during meals, and while houses share certain classes with other houses, students tend to sit and partner with members of their own house. Each house has its own common room and dormitory that are spread out in the school. For example, Slytherin's common room and dormitory are housed in the dungeons of Hogwarts, while Gryffindor's are housed in one of the highest towers. Spatial organization controls student movement because it is against school rules to be in a common room or dormitory other than one's own. The entrance to each house's spaces are kept "secret" from the other houses, and to further prevent intruders, enchanted portraits that open only with passwords guard each entrance. Close friendships between members of different houses, while not verbally outlawed, are nearly impossible to foster in that the organization of the physical space positions students to spend most of their time with members of their own house. Just as it was most convenient for Tom Brown to become best friends with his roommate Harry East, it is no coincidence that Harry Potter's closest friends are all in Gryffindor, and that his best friend, Ronald Weasley, is also his roommate. The rules associated with which spaces in Hogwarts members of each house are allowed to occupy enhance the sentiments of belonging to one's house, and "house" comes to embody the student members and their designated spaces.

The competition for the House Cup further creates fissures between the houses and influences how students interact with one another. Yet again, the tyranny of the playing fields is evoked as Hogwarts' houses compete against one another in the game of Quidditch, and this directs students' energies towards performing for the benefit of their house. Students are awarded "House Points" throughout the year that are accumulated from Quidditch scores and individual student behaviours: "your triumphs will earn you house points, while any rule-breaking will lose house points" (1. 85-5). The house holding the most points at the end of the year is awarded the House Cup, which is considered a "great honour" (86). These trophies, which hold merit only within the walls of Hogwarts, build an atmosphere of competition among students. The house system, coupled with the House Cup, are imperative to students' socialization process in teaching individuals to care about community success above personal achievement.

"I will only truly have left this school when none here are loyal to me": Hogwarts and Dumbledore

Similar to all other school spaces considered in this study, Hogwarts is the key to the sustainment of the wizarding world's hegemonic power structures, and if a student or graduate wishes to change magical society it can be done only through control of the school space. From Books One (*Philosopher's Stone*) to Six (*Half-Blood Prince*) Hogwarts is led by Albus Dumbledore, the "greatest Headmaster Hogwarts ever had" (1.48). As Headmaster, Professor Dumbledore has substantial influence over the magical community in his socialization of its children and youth. Henry Giroux argues that school spaces are always political because they produce certain types of "agents, desires, and social relations" that directly shape hegemonic society (*Education* 172). The type of graduates Hogwarts produces is determined by the Headmaster and thus the power to form society is located fundamentally in the hands of an individual. Professor Dumbledore's

power is represented as nonthreatening because of his construction as the "good" antithesis to Lord Voldemort's "evil" in that Dumbledore is "the only one You-Know-Who was afraid of" (1.45). In his goodness, Dumbledore is portrayed as the ideal leader and standard of just authority whom Harry learns to respect and obey during his rule-breaking. Although offered the position of Minister for Magic (comparable to Canada's position of Prime Minister) several times, Dumbledore turns down the position to remain Headmaster of Hogwarts. Dumbledore confides to Harry he declined the other position because of his quest for power as a young man unveiled a dark side, but Dumbledore arguably holds the most powerful leadership position in the wizarding community as Headmaster of Hogwarts. Dumbledore believes there "can be nothing more important than passing on ancient skills, helping hone young minds" (6.414), and for decades he shapes magical society through controlling and overseeing the character formation and moral education of students.

The influence of fictional Headmasters/mistresses and principals on the sustainment of their hegemonic society is depicted throughout school stories, especially in the examples covered in this dissertation. Thomas Arnold in life, and in Hughes's depiction of him, wanted to Christianize British society through "saving" his students in the hopes that students would transform adult society when they graduated (Honey 3, 7). The federal Canadian government and IRS administrators attempted to assimilate Indigenous peoples into settler society to gain more control over First Nation's resources, and against which protagonists in Chapter Three rebelled. In Chapter Four, the principal in Todd Strasser's lethal violence school story indicated he felt indentured to the surrounding neoliberal adult community to groom graduates who would excel in an aggressive, self-interested, and corporate culture. School heads in dystopian school stories rely on their schools' socialization of youth to sustain their corrupt governments. Dumbledore

shares the power of influence of these other school heads, but he aligns most closely with Arnold in that his rule is largely accepted, and later defended, by his students.

Dumbledore downplays the power of influence he has as Headmaster, but Lord Voldemort and the Ministers for Magic Cornelius Fudge and Rufus Scrimgeour understand the power imbued in the role. As seen throughout the school story subgenre, those who control the socialization of young people have the greatest potential influence on the formation of society. Voldemort wishes to radically transform society under his dictatorship, and he discerns that control of Hogwarts is essential if he wishes to gain control over the entire state. In the fifth novel in the series, *The Order of the Phoenix* (2003), the government is under the insidious influence of Voldemort and it attempts to defuse Dumbledore's power and influence, which betrays Hogwarts' significant position in society. By order of the Ministry for Magic, Dolores Umbridge, Senior Undersecretary to the Minister for Magic, is instilled at Hogwarts as the Defence Against the Dark Arts Professor and Hogwarts' High Inquisitor. Minister Fudge is convinced that "Dumbledore is forming a private army for himself from his students to take on the Minister" (5. 272), and installs Dolores to undermine Dumbledore's power and influence over the students (5.193). Minister Fudge's concern is not completely unfounded, as students are socialized through their school experience to be devoted and loyal to Dumbledore, and they respond to the government's interference by doing exactly what it had feared: forming an unsanctioned club called Dumbledore's Army (hereafter referred to as D.A.).

In the series sixth book, *The Half Blood Prince* (2005), the new Minister Rufus Scrimgeour attempts to recruit Harry as a "poster boy" for the government by visibly aligning with the Ministry for Magic instead of Dumbledore. When Harry refuses, the Minister replies, "Well, it is clear to me that he has done a very good job on you . . . Dumbledore's man through

and through" (6.326). Both governments' attempts to intercede at Hogwarts reveal the extent to which Dumbledore's power is coveted by the Ministry, exposes the integral role of Hogwarts in the construction or maintenance of the state, and unveils the devotion to Dumbledore that students' school experiences have imbued within them as furthering his power and influence.

Voldemort also attempts entry into Hogwarts to build his power and influence. In the seventh book, *The Deathly Hallows* (2007), Voldemort successfully infiltrates the school with his Death Eaters and intends to quell student devotion to Dumbledore's values and redirect student loyalties towards himself. Prior to this, Voldemort twice applied for teaching positions at Hogwarts and was both times denied by Dumbledore, who later explains to Harry his belief that Voldemort, "as a teacher . . . would have had great power and influence over young witches and wizards. . . . I do think that he saw it as a useful recruiting ground, and a place where he might begin to build himself an army" (6.404). Voldemort comprehends that to seize sovereignty of society he must socialize children and youth to accept and support his rule. Just as Elisabeth Rose Gruner argues that "education is centrally concerned . . . with power" (218), the continual battle for control of Hogwarts is a battle for power. Ultimately Dumbledore wins the battle, for even when he is physically absent from the school (he dies in book Six), Harry and his friends have been socialized under Dumbledore's leadership through their rule-breaking to resist figures of authority who threaten the societal structures that were endorsed during Dumbledore's reign.

The Conservative Structures of Hogwarts

Prior to analyzing Harry and his companions' rebellions, it is imperative to uncover their conservative intentions and their dissemination of Victorian ideologies even in the reimaging of students' citizenship. Rowling introduces into students' moral education the notion that it is their

responsibility to resist unjust and repressive systems. Hogwarts seems to be an inclusive space under the direction of Dumbledore, and students are valued not for their birth or blood—which is how Voldemort seeks to order society—but for their actions and treatment of others. Issues of social justice emerge throughout the series: for example, Hermione attempts to free house elves from slavery with her S.P.E.W. (Society for the Promotion of Elfish Welfare) campaign, and the wizardry war fights against Voldemort's pursuit of a pure-blooded race of witches and wizards. However, Galway argues that what is "on the surface," a "champion[ing] [of] equality and diversity," is, in practice, "inherently gendered and elitist traditions of [the] genre" (67). Likewise, Farah Mendelsohn concludes that the series argues "superficially for fairness" but in actuality "portray[s] privilege and exceptionalism. . . . [T]hey embody inherently conservative and hierarchical notions of authority" (181). *Harry Potter* remains at its core a conservative school story that perpetuates Victorian values and virtues. Let us examine just a few of the arguments against Rowling's liberal and innovative society in order to undercover the conservative nature of her world.

Depictions of Gender Equality

The portrayal of Hermione Granger has garnered Rowling praise for promoting a coeducational school space with gender equality, but nonetheless the series validates nineteenth-century notions of masculine superiority. Galway argues that Hermione never becomes an equal peer with Ron Weasley and Harry, and this is evident in their view of her "as somewhat bossy," their teasing her "for being very studious" (Rowling 1.74), and that her cleverness even puts Ron into a "very bad temper" (Rowling 1.127). Victorian school stories often feature trios of close friendships, and Karen Manners Smith notes the "rule of three to fight off unnaturally close friendships"

functions the same way in *Harry Potter*: by including Hermione "Rowling constructs and maintains a classically intense schoolboy friendship for Harry and Ron, simultaneously freeing it from any traces of 'unnatural closeness'" (75). Smith does find it innovative to include a girl in this three-way friendship, but Hermione's functioning as Ron's romantic interest, thus freeing any potential queer undertones between Harry and Ron, is less radical. While Hermione usually takes part in Harry and Ron's adventures, her talents are nearly always used in the service of Harry's quest (Pugh and Wallace 270), and she is often rendered immobile by fear (Armstrong 244). When Hermione undertakes her own projects, they are met with annoyance from her school peers and close friends. Galway argues that Hermione's perceived bossiness and her continued service to Harry "[reify] Hughes's nineteenth-century notions of masculine leadership and companionship" rather than promote gender equality (74).

Much scholarship has been written on female representation in *Harry Potter*,[66] but I will focus on a specific example of Hermione's individual interests being met with Harry and Ron's derision as a significant instance that illustrates the disparity between masculine and feminine representation in the series. Social justice in the series is tied mainly to Harry's battle against Voldemort's genocidal, pure-blood agenda, but Hermione is also concerned with the welfare of house elves who have been slaves to their owners for thousands of years. Hermione mounts the campaign S.P.E.W. to emancipate the elves from their servitude. Hermione's activism is inconvenient to the wizarding world, for providing elves their freedom would not guarantee their sustained labour, would require monetary payment for the elves' services, and would involve the

[66] For more on gender and *Harry Potter* see Eliza T. Dresang's "Hermione Granger and the Heritage of Gender" (2002); *Females and* Harry Potter*: Not All That Empowering* (2006) by Ruthann Mayes-Elam; Meredith Cherland's "Harry's Girls: *Harry Potter* and the Discourse of Gender" (2008); and Rachel Armstrong's "Sexual Geometry of the Golden Trio: Hermione's Subversion of Traditional Female Subject Positions" (2015).

evolution of relationships between elves and their employers if the magical community wished to continue receiving their services. In a conservative society, S.P.E.W. is a radical and innovative campaign that would dramatically change state policy.

Harry is "exasperated" and Ron is "dumbstruck" by Hermione's campaign announcement and her assumption that her close friends will help (4.199-8). Other peers who Hermione attempts to recruit to her cause find the crusade boring. Lauren Byler argues that characters' responses to S.P.E.W. make Hermione's political activism "appear dreary, impractical, or misguided" because it does not have "a goal of preserving the traditions of a world under attack" (131). Instances of political activism that introduce liberal and innovative policies that would greatly alter society are disregarded for more conservative ones: Hermione's S.P.E.W. energies give way to the D.A. club, which receives a more enthusiastic reception from her peers because it does not require "breaking down entrenched barriers between groups for the benefit of society at large with the possible result of inconveniencing and disempowering those who previously benefitted from the hierarchical arrangement" (Byler 132-33). Byler notes that Hermione's struggle to sustain S.P.E.W. is indicative of Rowling's "politically liberal investments in equality and individual choice . . . shar[ing] values with neoliberalism that preserve certain hierarchical and oppressive social structures" (116). In her attempt to emancipate the house elves, Hermione is initially an advocate of social justice, but she must ultimately forget her efforts because "the collective political action is treated . . . as a dull topic, difficult to sustain, and less compelling than narrower concerns of family and romance" (Byler 130).

The failed campaign comes to be indicative of Hermione's gender, and her femininity is evoked in her involvement. Hermione is considered by Harry and Ron as too emotional and lacking rationality in her concern for the elves, and the substance of her campaign largely

involves the domestic act of knitting clothing for the elves (they become freed if offered clothing), an activity in which Harry and Ron are not willing to participate. She takes on the persona of a nagging women in her "badgering" Harry and Ron to wear their badges and recruitment of others to the cause, to which Ron responds with "rolled" eyes (4.210). Hermione likewise "glowers" at Neville until he succumbs to the cause (4.210). Most of her peers regard her mission as a "joke" (4.210). The house elves themselves shun Hermione's aid, as they themselves are too entrenched in the system to consider an alternative, which depicts Hermione's activism as irrational, mad, and obsessive. Hermione's irrationality is further emphasized in her being described as "curt" (4.210), and "hot" (4.211): she "hisses" when Harry asks when "are you going to give up on this S.P.E.W stuff?" (4. 281). An unnamed staff-written article on *Pottermore*, "To S.P.E.W or not to S.P.E.W.: Hermione Granger and the Pitfalls of Activism," outlines the pros and cons of Hermione's campaign. Included in the cons section is a description of Hermione as "at best overzealous, and her goals are, at worst, unattainable" and that the "trouble" with S.P.E.W. was "Hermione wants it all and wants it now" ("To S.P.E.W"). Regardless of the subject of Hermione's campaign, it is a rare story-line in her character arc that is not in service of Harry (arguably the other is her romantic relationship with Victor Krum, though this also annoys Ron, and to a lesser extent, Harry), one that is used to characterize Hermione as foolish when she strays from Harry's more just, immediate, and deserving rebellions.

The Absence of Queer Characters

The romantic relationships at Hogwarts are all heterosexual, making the LGBTQ community completely absent from the series. Not one student questions his or her sexual identity or

expresses a romantic interest in a member of the same sex. Heteronormativity extends to the outside world as the entire wizarding community is depicted in mixed-gendered couples; Tison Pugh and David L. Wallace argue that the omission of queer characters "flattens the marvellous range of diversity" (264). During a public interview following the conclusion of the written series, Rowling revealed she had "always thought Dumbledore was gay" (Malkin), and she imagines him to have had an ill-fated romance with Gellert Grindelwald.[67] Upon this declaration the crowd erupted in applause and gave Rowling a standing ovation, and Rowling is reported as laughing and answering, "If I'd known it would make you so happy, I would have announced it years ago!" ("Carnegie Hall"). Fans, scholars, and critics have eagerly embraced this addition, and of course it has also been met with outrage from more conservative fans. But it raises the question that if Rowling did indeed always imagine Dumbledore was gay, why she did not include this in the series? The standing ovation to her declaration is hollow as it rewards an intention rather than an action, and Pugh and Wallace state that "it was Rowling who put Dumbledore in the closet, and she now receives credit for taking him out of it" ("Postscript" 191). Pugh and Wallace read Rowling's post-series announcement as delineating Dumbledore's homosexuality as not important enough to include in the novels and that mentioning it after only situates "[g]ays [as] second-class citizens . . . [in which] their difference is hidden from view. . . . Heterosexuality is celebrated and homosexuality is silenced" ("Postscript" 191). Rowling's announcement interjects some belated queerness into the series, but that the information of Dumbledore's sexuality appears in a post-series interview that is not explored in the canon substantially stalls any meaningful inclusive of queer characters.

[67] See Kenneth Kidd's "Outing Dumbledore" (2008) and Karin E. Westman's "The Weapon We Have is Love" (2008) for scholarly reactions to Rowling's announcement.

Many remain frustrated by the continued absence of queer characters in the expansion of the *Harry Potter* universe. Three film adaptations (*Half-Blood Prince* [2009], *Deathly Hallows Part 1* [2010], and *Deathly Hallows Part 2* [2011]) were released in the wake of Rowling's announcement, but did not touch on Dumbledore's sexuality. Arguably, there was opportunity for an admission during Dumbledore and Harry's deepening relationship in *Half-Blood Prince,* or in the posthumously leaked details of Dumbledore's private life in the final two films. The omission is especially noticeable when his "friendship" with Grindelwald is revealed in the films, but their romance remains excluded. As well, there are no explicitly queer characters in *The Cursed Child* play, though some have found queer undertones in the relationship of Albus Potter (Harry's son) and Scorpius Malfoy (Draco's son) and are disappointed that the romance was not made clear (Romano; Masad; Chellman).

Finally, though Rowling has teased that Dumbledore's sexuality would be addressed in one of the *Fantastic Beasts and Where to Find Them* films (the films take place in Rowling's wizarding world during the 1920s and feature a young Dumbledore), director David Yates has indicated that Dumbledore's sexuality will not be addressed in the upcoming 2018 film *Fantastic Beasts: The Crimes of Grindelwald* (Bradley). Laura Bradley of *Vanity Fair* speaks to fans' disappointment in Dumbledore's sexuality continuing to be ignored, and Bradley echoes many others' questions of "why, then, should it [the new film] bother being coy about Dumbledore's personal life—especially in a film that essentially pits the character against his terrible ex-boyfriend?" (Bradley).

The *Harry Potter* canon and expanded universe can hardly make claims of diversity and inclusion with the absence of LGBTQ characters. The sustained queer undertones that linger behinds curtains but are never invited to centre stage. For example, Harry's and Ron's

homoerotic bond, are more in line with Golden Age and late Edwardian school stories that covertly address same-sex relationships in public schools as a fear and consequence of the monastic herding of same-sex students rather than the construction of a truly diverse and inclusive community. The undertones perpetuate queerness as deviant and devious behaviour unworthy of movement past the periphery. Notably, however, some readers have not allowed Rowling's exclusion of queer characters to limit their own imaginations: Harry Potter slash (same-sex relationships) fanfiction has flourished as readers reimagine characters as queer or introduce new queer characters to the universe.[68] Notably, a popular reimaging is a Harry and Draco romance in which their perpetual conflicts with one another are infused with erotic undertones. Readers' insertion of queer characters into the space of Hogwarts is one of many examples of fans refusing and resisting the conservative and restrictive boundaries of the canonical space, and it is an extension that will be explored further on with the March for Our Lives movement.

Hogwarts' Whitewashing of Difference

Another aspect Rowling has been hailed for is her creation of a postcolonial space that functions outside the confines of race. This praise has been awarded simply for Rowling's inclusion of people of colour in her series. More recently, however, critics and fans have engaged in fruitful discussions of how diversity is represented, or rather not represented, in the novels and expanded

[68] For more thorough discussions of the ways fans are addressing the lack of queerness and filling the gap themselves through slash fanfiction, see Catherine Tosenberger's "Homosexuality at the Online Hogwarts: *Harry Potter* and Slash Fanfiction" (2008); Tison Pugh and David L. Wallace's "A Postscript to 'Heteronormative Heroism and Queering the School Story in J. K. Rowling's *Harry Potter* Series'" (2008); and Jennifer Duggan's "Revising Hegemonic Masculinity: Homosexuality, Masculinity, and Youth-Authored *Harry Potter* Fanfiction" (2017).

multi-media universe.[69] Giselle Liza Anatol refutes the praise of Rowling's attempt "to embrace ideas of global equality and multiculturalism" and illustrates that these attempts "actually reveal how difficult it is for contemporary British subjects such as Rowling to extricate themselves from the ideological legacies of their ancestors" (165). Through such thoughtful interrogations of *Harry Potter*'s engagement with race, ethnicity, and colonialism it has become evident that Rowling's attempt at creating a multicultural, diverse, and inclusive space functions rather to further erase (or whitewash) cultural difference and defers to an assumed whiteness of characters.

There are many covert instances of *Harry Potter*'s continuation of colonial practices. For example, Ron's brothers Bill and Charlie are employed in colonialist ventures to bring "apparently superior European knowledge and experience to the 'frontier'" and "more importantly, [to] bring its rewards back 'home' to the heart of the empire" (Anatol 164). Charlie studies dragons, and travels the globe to find and capture different species. Bill is a charm-breaker who works to unlock spells put on tombs by ancient Egyptian wizards and brings the found treasures home to England. Bill "participates in . . . deplet[ing] an area of historical and cultural treasures for British wizard-world profit" (Anatol 164). Both professions are met with Harry's awe, and there is absolutely no critical examination of how these professions continue colonial practices. Colonial careers that deplete the resources of others and transplant "superior" British culture onto nations considered "developing" or "third world" are normalized through Harry's excitement that such "exciting" work is possible without considering the consequences of such colonial work.

---

[69] For more on postcolonialism and race in *Harry Potte*r see Hannah Lamb's "The Wizard, the Muggle, and the Other: Postcolonialism in *Harry Potter*" (2015).

As is the case with the majority of English literature, whiteness is dominant and the default for "unmentioned race" (Anatol 173), and Rowling's inclusion of people of colour is tokenistic, excluding any "representation of ethnic difference and cultural practices" (Anatol 173). For example, twin sisters Parvati and Padma Patil and Cho Chang's ethnicities are signalled only by their names. Similarly, Lee Jordan's "brown" skin and "dreadlocks" (5.10), and Dean Thomas's "black" skin tone alone act as markers of diversity ("Dean Thomas," *Harry Potter Lexicon*).[70] The Patil twins, Cho, Dean, and Lee function as tokens of diversity who remain flat and underdeveloped on the periphery of the series. In the attempt to portray a "colour blind" society that is inclusive of difference, Rowling "makes it supremely easy for the reader to forget (or ignore) the multi-ethnic surroundings that she initially seeks to establish" (Anatol 173). When the five are brought further into the narrative it is usually in service of Harry's mission, such as becoming members of the D.A.

Four of the five tokenistic characters serve as romantic interests for the series' main characters: Ron and Harry take the Patel twins to the Yule Ball; Harry is infatuated with Cho for much of *Goblet of Fire* and dates her in *Order of the Phoenix*; and Ginny dates Dean before she becomes romantically involved with Harry. These characters thus function as objects of desire for the main white characters, and in the case of Cho and Dean, they are a romantic trial-run before Harry and Ginny move on to their permanent (white) partners. Lee does not function as a romantic object of desire, but as the Quidditch commentator most of his dialogue praises Harry's athleticism, and this limits Lee's portrayal to reinforcing Harry's masculine heroism.

---

[70] In the American version of *Philosopher's Stone* (*Harry Potter and the Sorcerer's Stone*), Dean is described during the ceremony as a "Black boy even taller than Ron" ("Dean Thomas," *Fanlore*). This line was cut, apparently due to chapter length, by Rowling's British editor and does not appear in any of the UK and Canadian editions.

Fans have been further frustrated with the continued exclusion of people of colour in the film adaptations. Many of the *Harry Potter* characters are assumed to be white, as Rowling does not explicitly indicate characters' ethnicity except in the case of the five "diverse" characters. Film creators have perpetuated the assumed white identity of characters and kept the diverse tokenistic characters on the periphery. The limited role people of colour play in the *Harry Potter* films was made glaringly apparent in Dylan Marron's YouTube video "Every Single Spoken Word by a Person of Colour in the Harry Potter Films." The compilation of dialogue spoken by people of colour over the eight feature-length films amounts to six minutes and eight seconds of the entire twenty-hour runtime. What is said over these six minutes is equally significant: a large portion includes Lee Jordan's Quidditch commentary, which is a narration of Harry's athletic prowess; Harry's name is said sixteen times; there are fourteen instances when the "words" spoken by a person of colour are single words or sounds, such as "yes sir," "hi," "shhhh," "Oh, ummm," and "ah-ha!" In his post, Marron quotes Dumbledore's advice to Harry from the film *Deathly Hallows Part 2*: "Words are our most inexhaustible source of magic, capable of both inflicting injury and remedying it" (*Deathly Hallows Part 2*). The compilation video reveals the disproportionate extent to which white characters wield the magic of words, and that the silence of characters of colour indeed inflicts injury by prolonging the tokenistic and flat reliance on stereotypes and prejudices when representing diversity.

The creators of *The Cursed Child* stage play did challenge the assumed whiteness of characters by casting African actress Noma Dumezweni to play Hermione. The casting choice was met generally with praise, but some stood by the assumed whiteness of Hermione and were angry that the "change" altered the canon. Rowling intervened to express her delight with the casting and challenged the assumed whiteness of Hermione with a tweet: "Canon: brown eyes,

frizzy hair and very clever. White skin was never specified. Rowling loves black Hermione" (@jk_rowling). James Poniewozik of the *New York Times* argues it is beside the point whether Hermione had been descried as white or black in the series: "an actress creates a character by embodying her spirit, not by resembling previous performances"; and that the resistance to Dumezweni's being casting to play Hermione, who is discriminated against in the series for her inferior mudblood status "only proves how appropriate it [the casting] is" (Poniewozik).

The troubling depictions of female characters, the complete lack of queer characters, and the limited number and importance of multicultural and diverse characters limits the extent to which Hogwarts can be considered an inclusive space. It rather remains a nineteenth-century public-school space ordered by assumed male superiority, heteronormativity, and whiteness. Christopher Myers calls the lack of diversity in children's and YA literature an "apartheid" in which characters of colour play limited roles (as in *Harry Potter*) or are completely absent, and Myer's arguments can also be applied to the depiction of various gendered and queer identities (C. Myers, "Apartheid"). Myers argues that literature is both a mirror and map for readers: literature can be a mirror, and to recognize oneself in a text tells the reader "you are worthy of being told, thought about, discussed and even celebrated" (C. Myers, "Apartheid"); and literature functions as maps that provide readers "an atlas of their world, of their relationships to others, of their possible destinations" (C. Myers, "Apartheid"). When a diversity of experiences and people are pushed to the periphery, or are absent all together, readers are provided an inadequate and outdated map that imposes boundaries upon their imaginations of not only what they can be but also their perception of others (C. Myers, "Apartheid"). *Harry Potter* fails at being mirror for a large portion of its readership and relies on an outdated map—indeed, one that was first created by Hughes in the nineteenth century.

Issues of gender representation, exclusion of queer characters, and the flat and tokenistic depiction of people of colour are just some issues that reveal the conservative values and ideologies of Hogwarts. The school is grounded in outdated Victorian ideologies that privilege the experiences of some (straight, white, male). When Harry and his peers rebel against Voldemort, they do so to restore, not overthrow, these conservative, constrictive, and unimaginative structures. Yet, how readers have used the *Harry Potter* map for activism significantly goes beyond the boundaries chartered; indeed, Hogwarts's old-fashioned roots have acted as an inspiration and a narrative structure for radical political campaigns by readers/fans.

Rule-Breaking at Hogwarts

Steege argues that Tom Brown and Harry Potter both achieve a sense of belonging to their school through the shared experience of rule-breaking (149). Edmund Kern claims rule-breaking is important in offering an "exploration of the ambiguous tensions between rules and larger moral principles" (47), and that the *Harry Potter* series "suggests that truth-telling, submissions to authority, and following the rules are not always the moral things to do" (72). In his discussion of Kipling's *Stalky and Co.,* Dieter Petzold describes rule-breaking as "rejecting and accepting the rules of the school at the same time" (20), which suggests:

> [T]here exists a basic code of behaviour independent of institutionalized rules; not laws but The Law. It includes a chivalrous regard for, and protection of the weak (hence the boys' rejection of bullying), essential honesty (little ruses are acceptable), and patriotism. (20)

Student characters' acceptance *and* rejection of school rules through rule-breaking provides them a moral education regarding "The Law" which does not challenge the prevalent ideological

structures of Hogwarts but validates existing structures. Galway speaks to the education offered at Hogwarts and argues that Harry's education is achieved in a twofold process: what is learned in class and what he learns without, which often involves breaking rules, "and it is the latter that is often celebrated as more important in the school story genre" (81). Rowling raises the stakes of school story rule-breaking with the inclusion of a corrupt government and leader (Voldemort) who makes it essential for Harry and his classmates to exercise the basic code of behaviour Petzold describes in and *outside* of the school space in order to protect their society.

In Harry's early education, he breaks the laws of Hogwarts when they interfere with doing what is morally right; that is, he breaks the law to uphold The Law. One such example occurs in the first novel, *Philosopher's Stone*. A troll breaks into the school during a Halloween celebration and students are ordered to quickly return to their houses. Hermione is in a washroom during the announcement and does not know about the troll, so Harry and Ron disobey teachers' direct orders to find Hermione and warn her of the danger. The troll wanders into the same washroom Hermione occupies, and the three friends work together to protect one another and defeat the troll. Had Harry and Ron followed their teachers' directions, Hermione would likely have been killed by the troll. When the teachers rush in to find the defeated troll, Professor McGonagall is angrier than Harry had ever seen (1.145), and with a "cold fury" asks them, "Why aren't you in your dormitory?" (1.145). Hermione's defence of the boys' rule breaking, "If they hadn't found me, I'd be dead now" (1.45), defuses McGonagall's righteous anger: "Well—in that case" (1.148). In lieu of punishment, Harry and Ron are rewarded with five house points each (1.148). The episode provides the three with their first lesson in rule-breaking: it is acceptable to break institutional rules if those rules interfere with doing what is morally right. In addition to their being rewarded, the didacticism of this episode is made transparent when

Hermione, who up to this point abided blindly by all school rules, becomes "a bit more relaxed about breaking rules since Harry and Ron had saved her from the mountain troll and she was much nicer for it" (1.133-4). Hermione's being made "much nicer" signals her positive character formation from rule-breaking, and her budding friendship with Harry and Ron is a reward for her shifting beliefs.

Dumbledore's Endorsement of Rule-Breaking

The school space endorses the leadership of Professor Dumbledore and holds him as the ideal students should emulate, but it is Harry's rule-breaking in the first six books of the series that teaches him to respect, appreciate, and defend morally just leadership as portrayed by Professor Dumbledore. For their heroics and futures as civil servants, Harry and his friends require an education that develops traits of leadership, bravery, and a sense of what is morally just. [71] Harry's, Ron's, and Hermione's moral educations are achieved in their rule-breaking in the space of Hogwarts. Moreover, Dumbledore condones, allows, and even encourages the rule-breaking of the hero, for when Dumbledore "turns a blind eye to his [Harry's] rule breaking . . . [it is] out of a sincere belief that Harry is guided by reason, loyalty, and a commitment to justice" (Chevalier 405). Harry and his friends never break school rules simply for the sake of breaking those rules, but rule-break when institutional rules run contrary to a greater truth, right, or moral. Thus, Harry's, Ron's, and Hermione's rebellions, in the form of rule-breaking, are imperative to their moral education concerning justice and moral Law.

---

[71] *The Cursed Child* play reveals the adult professions of the characters: Harry and Hermione work in two of the highest positions at the Ministry of Magic as respectably the Head of Magical Law Enforcement and the Minister of Magic; Ginny is a journalist; and Neville is the Herbology professor at Hogwarts. Ron works with his older brother in his joke shop, Weasley's Wizard Wheezes, in Diagon Alley.

The trio's rule-breaking is condoned through Dumbledore's encouragement and rewards. In Harry's first year at Hogwarts, he becomes aware that Dumbledore is cognizant of all that transpires inside Hogwarts, including Harry, Ron, and Hermione's adventures that break several school rules. In *Philosopher's Stone,* Dumbledore does not intercede or aid in Harry's dangerous pursuit of Professor Quirrell, a teacher who is possessed by Lord Voldemort to steal the Philosopher's Stone. Ron wonders if Dumbledore "meant you [Harry] to do it?" (1.218), and Harry interprets Dumbledore's detachment as "he had a pretty good idea we were going to try, and instead of stopping us, he just taught us enough to help. . . . [I]t's almost as if he thought I had the right to face Voldemort if I could" (1.219).[72] Galway finds that Dumbledore is a valuable mentor to Harry because of his recognition that "a degree of independence is necessary if the hero is to absorb important lessons in a meaningful way" (75). Harry understands that Dumbledore has provided the group enough information to fight the morally compromised Professor Quirrell, and while Harry may have the right to face Voldemort because Voldemort murdered Harry's parents, the lesson gleaned from this rebellion has taught Harry he has the *right* to rebel against the laws of institutions when they compromise The Law.

Dumbledore repeatedly rewards rather than disciplines Harry, Ron, and Hermione when they break rules, and this further condones their rebellions as morally justifiable. In *Philosopher's Stone*, the trio of friends break several school rules, as well as disobey teachers' orders, to pursue Professor Quirrell and upset Voldemort's plan to capture the Philosopher's

---

[72] Similarly, in *Prisoner of Azkaban*, Dumbledore has full knowledge of a safe rebellion *and* encourages it. Dumbledore gently suggests to Hermione to use her Time Turner (enabling time travel) to save the lives of Sirius Black and the Hipgriff Buckbeak. To save both lives directly opposes the judicial ruling of the Ministry of Magic. When Harry and Hermione successfully finish their task, which involves breaking several Ministry of Magic laws in order to uphold greater moral Laws of justice and fairness, Dumbledore "beamed at them" (3.305), bestowing his approval of their rule-breaking.

Stone. After they successfully thwart Voldemort, which involves Quirrell burning to death in front of eleven-year-old Harry, and despite the opinions of Professor McGonagall and Professor Snape that they should receive punishments for their disobedience, Dumbledore rewards the three with house points. The rewarded points win Gryffindor the coveted House Cup and earn Harry, Ron, Hermione great favour in the eyes of their Gryffindor peers.

This episode is made complex by their peer Neville, who had attempted to convince the three not to leave the dormitory at night because it is against rules and is petrified (a spell that freezes) by Hermione for doing so. Directly following Dumbledore's public pronouncement of Harry's, Ron's, and Hermione's rewards, Neville also receives house points that acknowledge his bravery in the attempt to enforce the school's rules, and Dumbledore explains, "It takes a great deal of bravery to stand up to our enemies, but just as much to stand up to our friends" (1. 243). However, Harry, Ron, and Hermione are allocated fifty house points each, and Neville is awarded only ten. This offers a complicated lesson to the students of Hogwarts—and to readers: Harry, Ron, and Hermione are extolled for breaking rules that impeded their pursuit of upholding The Law, and Neville, who did not have full knowledge of their noble mission, is praised for trying to impede the three when he believed it was wrong that they were breaking school rules. Dumbledore's disproportionate reward to Neville imbues greater value to the actions of Harry, Ron, and Hermione. In both cases, the students do what they *believe* is right, moral, and just and Dumbledore's rewarding of both actions (breaking and following rules) communicates a respect for school rules alongside a caveat (the differing value of their awards) of when they should be disregarded.

In *Goblet of Fire* Harry is again rewarded for breaking rules during the Triwizard Tournament.[73] For the second task, competitors must determine a magical method to breathe underwater so as to rescue a sedated loved one from the bottom of a lake within the allotted time. Harry finds his loved one (Ron) along with the sister (Gabrielle) of a competitor and Harry worries she will drown if not freed within the time limit—this proves to be false and the loved ones were never in mortal danger. When the time limit comes dangerously close to expiring with no sign that his competitor will arrive to free Gabrielle, Harry breaks the task rule that competitors must free only their loved one and instead rescues Ron *and* Gabrielle. The transportation of both bodies is cumbersome, and Harry returns to the surface long after the time has expired, which forfeits his performance from being judged. Dumbledore intercedes on Harry's behalf with the tournament judges to consider the *intention* behind the broken rules: Harry truly thought Gabrielle would die and sacrificed his success in the task to save her life. The judges weigh Harry's intentions and award him second place, out of four, in the task for his demonstration of "moral fibre and merit" (4.440). Dumbledore's intercession, and the judges' point allocation, conveys Harry's choice to break a rule in order to protect a weak and threatened individual as more valuable than blindly following rules. Harry learns in these circumstances, and others throughout the series, that rules should be followed but are flexible when they threaten the greater good.

[73] Hogwarts hosts the Durmstrang Institute and the Beauxbatons Academy of Magic for a full academic year. A representative from each school competes in three tasks over the school year that are meant to test magical ability, intelligence, and courage. The winner receives the Triwizard Cup, a monetary prize, and earns prestige for their school.

Rebellions Outside Hogwarts

Harry, Ron, and Hermione's Political Espionage

The lessons Harry and his friends learn from Dumbledore through their rule-breaking and moral educations are put into practice in the final book of the series, *The Deathly Hallows*. Voldemort has infiltrated every level of government and has transformed the wizarding world into a corrupt dictatorship that has begun processes of ethnic cleansing to create a magically pure-blood race that will rule over witches, wizards, and Muggles (non-magical folk). Voldemort's style of leadership is the antithesis of the community predicated on values of equality, compassion, respect, and social justice (though in conventional and limited forms) that was demonstrated at Hogwarts under Dumbledore's leadership. Through the rule-breaking that fought against smaller-scale injustices safely within the walls of Hogwarts and under the gaze of Dumbledore, students were educated to see it as their responsibility to actively protest unjust policies and leaders. For Harry, Ron, and Hermione this means not returning to Hogwarts, and ending their formal education a year early, during which time Harry misses "Hogwarts itself . . . nearly as much as his ex-girlfriend [Ginny]" (7.258). Harry's memories of Hogwarts, both the building and its embodiment in Dumbledore (7.265), motivates Harry's rebellion. For their peers left behind at Hogwarts, their civic duties entail a sustained rebellion against their newly installed Death Eater teachers. Those who have successfully received a moral education from Dumbledore's Hogwarts rebel against Voldemort's new order to restore old structures. It is a conservative rebellion that does not seek innovative change, but that desires a return to old structures that were modelled as ideal in Harry's six years at Hogwarts under Dumbledore's leadership.

Harry, Ron, and Hermione spend most of the final book traversing the British countryside searching for the Horcruxes.[74] The group members are fugitives from the state and hunted by Voldemort's Death Eaters. Their mission to find and destroy the Horcruxes positions them as enemies of the state who seek to destroy the new power structures, and their formal education has prepared them for such a revolt. Alongside their sense of responsibility in combating injustice being seen as a product of their educations at Hogwarts, the tools and methods Harry, Ron, and Hermione use to challenge and dismantle Voldemort's state have all been learned at Hogwarts. Formal lessons from their classes on Spells, Potions, Magic History, Herbology, Care of Magical Creatures, and Defence Against the Dark Arts help the trio to evade the surveillance and capture of the Death Eaters and aid in their own search for the Horcruxes, which demonstrates that their academic education has been imperative to their moral rebellion. Without their six years at Hogwarts, and Hermione's studiousness, they would not have had the spells to hide their tent at night, materialize food, heal themselves from injuries, and counter Death Eater attacks. Nearly every lesson learned during their six years is utilized in the dangerous journey. This is a departure from the Golden Age public-school stories, as narrative time is seldom spent in formal lessons, and students rarely (if ever) use their Greek or Latin to solve narrative conflicts. In this departure from the Golden Age genre, Rowling imbues value into school curriculum as being nearly as important as her characters' moral educations.

---

[74] A Horcrux is an object in which, through dark magic, a witch or wizard can hide a fragment of their soul to "act as a future safeguard or anchor to life and to safeguard against death" ("Horcrux"). Horcruxes can be created only by committing murder, which splits the soul. Voldemort is made immortal by splitting his soul into seven pieces and hiding the Horcruxes throughout Britain. Only once all the Horcruxes are destroyed is Voldemort made mortal and able to be defeated.

Coupled with the practical magic (spells, potions, and so on) are the tactics Harry, Ron, and Hermione honed during their rule-breaking at Hogwarts. One example is the three heroes' use of Polyjuice Potion, a complicated and time-consuming brew that allows the drinker to assume the physical form of another person for one hour. In *Chamber of Secrets*, to sneak into the Slytherin house and covertly interview Draco Malfoy, the three friends concoct a Polyjuice Potion to assume the forms of Slytherin students. The episode combines classroom knowledge in that Hermione learns of Polyjuice from Professor Snape in class (2.122), and she uses the potion-brewing skills practised in class with surveillance tactics in that they use the potion to observe and gather information on Draco. The experiential knowledge the three gain from this escapade is put to serious use when they use the same tactic on three occasions in the final book to infiltrate the Ministry of Magic, steal a Horcrux from a vault in Gringotts Bank, and to safely travel to Godric's Hollow. These three events are pivotal in the acquisition of knowledge and resources needed to defeat Voldemort and would not have been possible without their expert use of the Polyjuice Potion.

Their use of Polyjuice at Hogwarts breaks several rules: it is against rules to assume the form of another student, or simply, to use Polyjuice; they steal ingredients for the potion from Professor Snape's private stores; and they enter the Slytherin common room. Breaking these rules perfects their construction and consumption of Polyjuice before it is needed for more serious rebellions. Several mistakes are made during their first use, such as: Hermione does not realize the potion takes a month to brew, and their plans are put on hold; Hermione mistakenly adds a cat hair to her potion, which results in her taking the form of a cat; and Ron and Harry stay out too long and are nearly caught by Draco when their potions wear off. This trial-and-error first experience convinces the three of the potion's utility, provides Hermione the foresight to

brew a large batch ahead of their long rebellion, instructs the three to be careful when retrieving their human hairs and to plan around how long the potion lasts—all knowledge that enables successful rule-breaking with minimal error in the last novel. Their rule-breaking at Hogwarts, such as with the Polyjuice, acts as an experimentation towards mastery of the methods needed to successfully rebel against their government in the final book, and this further position their rule-breaking as imperative to their future integration into political life.

The Battle for Hogwarts

Hogwarts is a locus of power in the wizarding world because the socialization of students determines hegemonic power structures, so it is only fitting that the final rebellion and battle take place at Hogwarts where the last Horcrux is located. Harry, Ron, and Hermione return to the school and are met by a large, student-led D.A. rebel faction. The rebels' name is a tribute to Dumbledore and his values, and he continues to act as the beacon of just power and authority. The D.A., like Harry, Ron, and Hermione, position themselves as enemies of the current state in their refusal to obey and affirm their loyalty to Voldemort, and they use every lesson from their education to fight against their oppressors.

The physical structures of the school space support and aid in the fight alongside the D.A firstly through the Room of Requirement.[75] Harry learns of the room from Dobby the house elf, who describes the room as "'a room that a person can only enter . . . when they have real need of it. Sometimes it is there, and sometimes it is not, but when it appears, it is always equipped for the seeker's needs'" (5.343). For Dumbledore, the Room becomes a washroom (4.417); for Tom

[75] Lord Voldemort learns that Harry has returned to Hogwarts, and he orders all loyal to him to attack the school. A large-scale attack commences on the Hogwarts's grounds between Voldemort's Death Eaters and the D.A. and Order of the Phoenix.

Riddle, a place to hide the diadem turned Horcrux; for Harry, a place to hide his annotated Potions book; for the D.A., a place to practice Defence Against the Dark Arts and a secret hideout of their resistance in Book Seven. Sarah K. Cantrell argues the Room is an example of Gilles Deleuze's any-space-whatever, which is "a perfectly singular space which has merely lost its homogeneity" (Deleuze 109), and thus holds unlimited potential for "transformation and reconfiguration . . . a space of infinite assembly and combination" (Cantrell 205). Cantrell notes that the Room of Requirement's "[l]acking apparent connection to the rest of the school" is what makes the Room's "'linkages' to Hogwarts . . . infinite" (206). The majority of these infinite possibilities, with the exception of Dumbledore's bathroom, involves the concealment of students' rule-breaking: Riddle's Horcrux is an illegal piece of dark magic; Harry's potions book leads him to cast an illegal and potentially fatal spell on Draco Malfoy; the formation of the D.A. club breaks the rules of Professor Umbridge's Educational Decree; the D.A. refuse to follow the rules of the Death Eaters, their new school administrators and teachers. In these cases, regardless of just or corrupt intentions, the space conceals the devious behaviours of students and thus validates these behaviours in abetting them. The Room exists "at the margins of safety and danger" in its connection and isolation from Hogwarts and provides the space for students "to resist and subvert adult authority" (Cantrell 195). In the Seventh Book, the Room provides the D.A's rebellion a safe harbour to recuperate, plan their rebellions, and hide from adult authority. Without the Room to hide in, the D.A. would be unable to sustain their rebellion.

The remaining physical space of Hogwarts unabashedly corroborates the rebellion of the D.A. by literally fighting alongside them. In Book Five, Professor Umbridge briefly unseats Dumbledore as Head, but the Head's office refuses to acknowledge her assumed power by denying her entrance to the office: "Umbridge tried to get back into his office last night. . . .

Couldn't get past the gargoyle. The Head's office had sealed itself against her" (5.554). To block Umbridge from physically assuming office is an example of the school space itself fighting against her values (informed by Voldemort, as she too seeks a pure-blood race) from infiltrating the space, and a show of support towards Dumbledore's values in remaining locked until he returns.

In Book Seven, when the Battle of Hogwarts commences, Professor McGonagall implores the material structures of Hogwarts to come to the aid of the rebellion: "Hogwarts is threatened. . . . Man the boundaries, protect us, do your duty to our school" (7.484). In McGonagall's summons, "Hogwarts" stands not just for the physical building, but it is the embodiment of the D.A.'s rebellion and their collective memories of the space when it was governed by Dumbledore. Under threat is the possibility of Hogwarts being restored to what it once was, and McGonagall aligns the space with the virtues endorsed by Dumbledore: the space and the values of loyalty, bravery, selflessness, and civic responsibility to issues of social justice are made indistinguishable from one another. McGonagall's call is answered by the statues around the school, who become animated and fight the Death Eaters, and the school portraits and paintings who taunt the Death Eaters and shout advice and encouragement to the rebels. The material space of Hogwarts thus aids and takes part in the rebellion, and this communicates that the space itself prefers the values demonstrated under Dumbledore's rule and also desires to be restored to these values.

The Deathly Hallows depicts a conservative rebellion that fights for the restoration of old structures, but the rebellion is innovative in that Golden Age public-school stories never extend rule-breaking beyond the school to the larger institution of the (adult) State. Harry owes much to Hughes's *Tom Brown*, but the domestic threat in *Harry Potter* greatly deviates from the early

subgenre and adds life-and-death struggles to the safe rebellions. Students, under the direction of Dumbledore, have active citizenship included in their moral education, and they are taught it is their responsibility and right to resist their *own* governments and institutions if The Law is threatened by their practices. While it is an extremely conservative rebellion that idealizes many Victorian ideologies and values, Rowling encourages readers to emulate Harry's and others' resistance and argues that it is the readers' responsibility to do so if just systems are threatened.

Harry Potter Inspiring Radical Political Change

While the characters of *Harry Potter* fight to restore and maintain conservative structures that unfortunately erase difference in the maintenance of colonial, racist, sexist, and homophobic ideals, many readers nonetheless emulate the central lesson that it is their responsibility and right to resist unjust structures through active citizenship to facilitate change and reform policies in ways that would drastically alter society. Readers have appropriated the lessons and words of *Harry Potter* to narrate and give meaning to their own rebellions, which do not seek to restore a previous system but aim instead to radically dismantle state and federal firearm policies with innovative and compassionate structures. While Harry has fought to restore hegemonic society to a former ideal, some readers fight for progress in their own hegemonic society. In other terms, Harry is concerned with restoring the past, but some readers look to improving the future.

Mass public protests reminiscent of the 1960s civil rights movement and 1970s Vietnam protests have resurged in the United States, Canada, and Britain since the election of American President Donald Trump in November 2016. The first Women's March on 21 January 2017 gathered over four million Americans in more than six hundred cities across the country (Frostenson); protests against President Trump's Executive Order 13769 (what is more

colloquially known as the "Muslim ban") incited protests in airports, on the White House lawn, and in thousands of cities across the globe; and the People's March for Europe drew tens of thousands who marched on the British Parliament to express their discontent with Brexit (B. Quinn). Among these and other protests, Rowling's words have lettered protesters' signs. Photographed at the 2017 Women's March around the world were signs reading "Dumbledore's Army, Still Recruiting" (D. Quinn), "This Wouldn't Happen at Hogwarts" (Neal), and a young girl wearing a pink "pussy" hat was photographed with a sign reading, "When Voldemort is President We Need a Nation of Hermiones!" (Figure 1).

Figure 1. Neal, Bradi. "Harry-Potter Inspired Signs Totally Ruled Women's Marches Around the World" *Bustle*, 22 Jan. 2017, bustle.com/p/harry-potter-inspired-signs-totally-ruled-womens-marches-around-the-world-32206.

These few examples collapse the boundaries between fiction and reality to compare the Women's March resistance to state policies and the election of President Trump to the struggles in *Harry Potter*. These signs employ Rowling's narrative to give form to the protesters' challenges and function as a shorthand to communicate to others familiar with *Harry Potter* the intention of the march (to fight injustice) and the high stakes involved with their protest: if

Trump is comparable to Voldemort, as the signs suggest, then fundamental human rights are at stake.

Although *Harry Potter* has been a common feature at many marches and protests, I wish to conclude this chapter with a focus on the March for Our Lives movement, a youth-mounted resistance seeking to reform gun laws in the United States. The March aligns particularly well with the subject of this dissertation as it is a youth-run movement that was born from trauma in the school space and seeks to make schools, and consequently the rest of society, safer through reformed gun laws. On 14 February 2018 a rampage shooting at Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School in Parkland, Florida, claimed the lives of seventeen students and teachers ("Florida Shooting"). Grief-stricken survivors of the shooting quickly captured the attention of media by entering into gun law debates. Seventeen-year-old Jaclyn Corin, who spent three hours captive in Stoneman Douglas, turned to social media to share her experience and found her friends doing the same (Cullen). Within hours the #NeverAgain hashtag was trending worldwide. Student Cameron Kasky began planning early stages of a march on Washington by the following day, and he called Corin to enlist her in his plan. Corin and Kasky then met with fellow students David Hogg and Emma González and started planning in earnest the March for Our Lives in Washington, D.C.

Before the march, the founders and other Stoneman Douglas survivors grabbed the attention of Congress, the NRA, and even President Trump. González addressed a gun control rally on 17 Feb. 2018, and the speech quickly went viral, making González the figurehead of the movement. González was clear in her intention to fight for stricter gun laws and defended youths' involvement by challenging those who believe "us kids don't know what we're talking about, that we're too young to understand how the government works, we call BS" (González).

On 22 February 2017, *CNN* hosted a televised town hall in which Parkland survivors questioned Senators Marco Rubio and Bill Nelson and House Representative Ted Deutch on whether "they would support banning certain assault-style rifles and refuse to take money from the NRA" (CNN). The requests were radical and aligned more directly with Hermione's S.P.E.W. campaign in that the request would benefit society at large, but with the result of inconveniencing and disempowering those who have previously benefitted from such policies (Byler). Ten million people watched Kasky, González, Hogg, Corin, and Alex Wind on *60 Minutes,* during which Kasky called theirs the "mass shooting generation" that has grown up "trapped in closets, waiting for police to come or waiting for a shooter to walk into our door" (Alfonsi). These youths have positioned themselves as active citizens in the fight for gun law reforms in the hopes of making the Parkland shooting the last rampage shooting.

On 24 March 2018, over two million people attended the March for Our Lives in cities across the United States. Several reporters noticed among the "Ban guns, not books" and "Books not Bullets" protest posters were allusions to, and direct quotations from, *Harry Potter*. A sample of these signs read:

> We grew up on Harry Potter. . . . Of course we're fighting back. @GilmoreGirl
>
> If Hogwarts students can defeat the Death Eaters, the U.S. students can defeat the NRA. (@SalkaJourneys qtd. in Elizabeth)
>
> Hey NRA TEENAGERS took down Voldemort. They'll take down YOU too. (@sarajcochran qtd. Elizabeth)
>
> Age is foolish and forgetful when it underestimates youth—Dumbledore. (@lolamilner qtd. Elizabeth)

> When I said I wanted the real world to be more like Harry Potter, I just meant the magic stuff, not the entire plot of book five where the government refuses to do anything about a death threat so the teenagers have to rise up and fight back. (Hansen qtd. in H. Anderson)

Hephzibah Anderson argues that the presence of *Harry Potter* at the march was not about "the naïve hope that an intractable issue such as gun control can be solved by waving a wand," but that the characters "pick up a lot of real-world nous as they take a stand for liberal values and do battle with He Who Must Not Be Named" (Anderson). Rachel Sklar for *CNN* called *Harry Potter* a blueprint for the March, and similarly Charlotte Alter of *Time Magazine* argued in a tweet during her coverage of the March:

> Harry Potter has almost become their [the protesters'] playbook: the Ones Who Lived fighting an 'evil' force that has infiltrated the government and brainwashed adults using only the power they've learned in school: illumination, protection, disarmament. (@CharlotteAlter)

Like the signs seen at the Women's March and Anti-Trump rallies, *Harry Potter* is not only an inspiration for resistance, but provides a shorthand narrative to communicate the level of corruption that is being opposed.

Indeed, the March for Our Lives organizers welcomed the comparison of their cause to the resistance in *Harry Potter*. Lisa Miller asked González if texts like *The Hunger Games* and *Harry Potter* prepared her for political activism. González "shrugs off the Katniss comparison," but admits she loves "Harry Potter alone" (Miller). Miller makes much of González's admission that her favourite characters are Ginny Weasley and Luna Lovegood:

> It was Ginny . . . [who] coined the name "Dumbledore's Army" for the unauthorized student organization that met in secret. . . . It was Ginny and Luna who . . . reactivated Dumbledore's Army, swelled now to a full-scale rebellion in the war. (Miller)

Miller makes the connection between Ginny and Luna's role in the *Harry Potter* youth resistance movements and González's role in the March for Our Lives movement. On 25 March 2018, González retweeted De Elizabeth's article that compiled *Harry Potter* themed signs from the March, which further indicates González's endorsement of the comparison. Similarly, Parkland survivor Anna Crean views her activism as a consequence of her saturation with youth heroism in children's and YA literature, and explains to Miller,

> We've grown up with teenagers in dystopian eras that have fixed everything. . . . [T]hen they put us into a dystopian era in real life and they don't expect us to do anything? We can make a difference because that's what books and movies have told us since we were little. (Miller)

Books like *Harry Potter,* a school story, depict youth resistance as capable of achieving political change, and González and Crean were convinced they could do the same.

I would not go so far as to credit *Harry Potter* for completely inspiring the March for Our Lives resistance, but it has at the very least convinced some readers of their potential political power, their responsibility to be active citizens, and provided some a narrative with which to frame and articulate their struggle. *Harry Potter*, similar to the youth-authored, IRS, and dystopian school stories, can help young readers and activists to develop a more sophisticated understanding of the complexities of social organization than is offered by the simplistic rationale (be kinder to one another) offered by the lethal violence books. Reading narratives in which student characters live actively in their school spaces through various forms of rebellion

models to readers alternative avenues in which to move through their own school spaces and the larger society that structures their schools. As Michel de Certeau argues, the act of reading is like renting a room, poaching, and travelling in which a reader "creates something un-known in the space organized by their capacity for allowing an indefinite plurality of meanings" (169). Just as Gordon does in the *Loom of Youth*, readers can compare the school spaces of the novels to those which they physically reside in, and their defamiliarization facilitates an awakening to how their school spaces, and broader systemic forces, work upon themselves and other student bodies. Many of the March for Our Lives activists have demonstrated creative reading practices in their appropriation of the conservative lessons in *Harry Potter* to fuel radical rebellions against gun laws that intend to usher in new policies and systems of governance.

Conclusion

Harry Potter and Hogwarts represent a return to Victorian hegemonic spaces that privilege those who can embody a white, heterosexual, male identity; although Rowling's school space is highly conservative, it is revolutionary and departs from its Golden Age ancestors with its appeal to youth to engage civically, even providing "permission" for youth revolt against the dominant societies within which they live. Unlike the Golden Age school stories, Rowling's *Harry Potter* does not propagate blind obedience to authority figures, nor to adults generally in the stilted power-dynamics in youth and adult relationships, but it urges its protagonists, and presumably its readers, to be suspicious of authority and pledge loyalty only to those who have proven themselves to exercise power and authority faithfully. Rowling reintroduces an idyllic school space able to meet students' expectations and uses the moral education provided within the idyllic space to fuel revolutionary attitudes of students. Even in Hogwarts, a school space that

does not seek to oppress its students and is highly conventional, readers are encouraged to emulate Harry's revolutionary actions by adopting non-conformist attitudes that seek progress and innovation. The March for Our Lives movement is one such example of youth readers internalizing Harry's moral education and utilizing it to seek progressive and liberal change in the form of reformed gun laws rather than to surrender to old models.

Conclusion

> "I am all alone at my school, but I know I am not alone."
>
> — Havana Chapman-Edwards, @TheTinyDiplomat

Beverly Lyon Clark argues that school stories are time capsules that "embody the crises and values of their age" (9). As such, the school stories examined in this study embody a wide array of historical and contemporary crises and values. British public-school stories exemplified the ideals associated with Britain's imperial projects of colonization such as ambition, discipline, leadership, team spirit and so forth, and the stories were essential in communicating to Britain's youth a unified national identity that enshrined characteristics of obedience, loyalty, and selfless bravery. The young authors of the novels examined in Chapter Two reacted to the substantial casualties of the First World War; they reconsidered the surface ideologies endorsed by adult-authored school stories, namely, unquestioning loyalty and obedience to King and country, and they reimagined school spaces to include student autonomy and participation in their educations to foster critical thinking. The IRS picturebooks demonstrate the legacy and lasting consequences of colonialization from the perspectives of the colonized, they depict the integral role institutionalized education played in the cultural genocide of Canada's Indigenous peoples, and they participate in the project of bearing witness to the traumatic history of Canada. Following the Columbine rampage, the growing frequency and scale of school shootings are addressed in the lethal violence school stories, and in their focus on the bullying behaviours of youth exhibit the difficulty and apprehension of many adult authors to link school violence to the systemic values and ideologies of adult society that aggravate violence. The inescapable nature of surveillance technology and how the state may use information gleaned by surveillance to

monitor and control the masses is imagined in dystopian school stories. From colonization, war, school violence, and technology, the crises and values represented in the school stories examined in this study are extensive and varied. The breadth of the subgenre demonstrates the diverse ideological structures with which school spaces intersect.

The nature of the crises and values depicted in school stories, and whether these values are accepted, rejected, or interrogated by the texts, are in constant flux. But in the midst of perpetual change, there is much that has stayed consistent throughout the subgenre. First, present from the Golden Age public-school stories through to *Harry Potter* and beyond is the focus the narratives place on how their governing states utilize schools to indoctrinate and socialize youth in the attempt to sustain current structures. In the Introduction, I included Elisabeth Rose Gruner's argument that the school space functions as a site of "homogenization and social control" (218), and that it stands for the ideals and expectations of the narratives' culturally dominant societies. Gruner's argument holds true for all the texts examined in this study, although it fluctuates if characters accept or resist being socialized, or being made docile, to fit within the specified homogenous groups endorsed by their disciplinary school spaces. In the Golden Age public-school stories, for example, the socialization of youth meant instilling characteristics of obedience and loyalty into students to ensure future citizens would continue to unquestioningly support imperial endeavours. Also, in lethal violence school stories, school administrators and teachers spoke of their obligation to the surrounding neoliberal society to produce graduates who would excel in a competitive corporate climate. In *Harry Potter*, the forces of good (Dumbledore) and evil (Voldemort) fight over Hogwarts as each requires control over how youth are socialized to materialize their desired hegemonic structures—either

Voldemort's pure-race community versus Dumbledore's "diverse" and "inclusive" wizarding community.

Continuous throughout the school story subgenre is the importance of the school spaces' offered education to politics. Whether it be continuing imperial projects, challenging national prejudice, or reforming gun laws, all the texts position the school space as essential in determining current and future systems of governance. This convention is unrelenting in the school story subgenre and situates the subgenre as being highly political. Henry Giroux defines pedagogy as a "fight over modes of agency. . . how we're going to define how people are going to be agents in the world in which they're going to inhabit when they leave that school" ("Conversation"). The school story subgenre represents the "fight over modes of agency" in the persistent representation of schools and pedagogy being central to politics. Furthermore, the represented schools' centrality to politics is made evident by the depiction of governing structures directly influencing, manipulating, and enforcing how children and youth are socialized, and by what methods, in their schools.

The second constant in the subgenre is the "tyranny of the bloods," or the prominence of the winners-versus-losers' social structure that ensures success is defined in terms of domination. The playing fields remain a pivotal site of socialization throughout the subgenre; however, the playing fields' values shift from endorsing self-sacrificing team spirit in the boys' and girls' public-school stories to competitive individualism in the lethal violence school stories, dystopian school stories, and *Harry Potter*. Regardless of the changing emphasis from team to individual, the importance of sports in school stories injects the winners-versus-losers social structure into every school space. When athleticism is not the direct determinant of a school's social structure, such as in the IRS picturebooks and *The Testing* trilogy, social relationships between peers, and

between students and adult staff, remain predicated on domination. This fulfils the demands of adult society for loyal and obedient team members—as in public-school stories and IRS picturebooks—or self-interested, competitive, leaders—the product that a neoliberal society demands. What type of graduate is desired has shifted throughout time, but the culture of competition and domination that was refined on the Rugby playing fields continues to influence the relationships of all those housed in the school space: peers, adult teachers, and administrators.

Thirdly, unfailing in school stories is the barred participation of represented children and youth in determining the values, policies, and laws that structure their lives. School spaces are regularly represented as crucial to politics, but represented students are discouraged from meaningful political participation. Giroux describes North American schools as zones of social abandonment that have "become subject to pedagogies of oppression and purged of the experiences, values and creativity necessary for students to expand and deepen their knowledge, values and imagination" ("Striking"). The pedagogy Giroux describes has been present in school stories since the Golden Age, where pedagogy consisted of rote memorization that discouraged creative and critical thinking. Post-Golden Age, the school stories examined in this study consistently present pedagogy that is limited to regurgitating memorized facts that limits the development of students' critical thinking.

What has shifted is how student characters respond to their being excluded from participation—progressively, many characters refuse to be made docile by education. Henri Lefebvre and Michel de Certeau supported Michel Foucault's assertion that the net of discipline is everywhere, but that individuals and groups can subvert and evade being made docile by living actively to appropriate hegemonically produced spaces. Many of the school stories in this study

depict protagonists who live actively in their school spaces, and by enacting their agency they appropriate and change the spaces to fit their needs. These texts increasingly represent child and youth characters as integral parts of their hegemonic societies, and who do not abide in separate spheres of "childhood innocence" that excludes them from "adult" society. Children are commonly heralded as "the future," and this designation situates children and youth as only valuable to society in their future as adults and devalues young peoples' participation in the present. The school stories that feature students who live actively in their oppressive school spaces demonstrate that children and youth have power in the "now," and have value not only as "future adults" but in their current life stages as children and youth. The oppressive school stories situate their youth characters as holding the power to effect wide-spread societal change and they often model active political engagement to readers.

Lastly, and most importantly, reading school stories, from the conservative to the radical, is an everyday practice and tactic that functions as a form of rebellion, resistance, and subversion of the oppressive disciplinary structures that work upon the bodies of children and youth. Aparna Mishra Tarc asserts that "language indelibly affects us—our survival and the quality of our existence depend on language to thrive and live" (1). Akin to Thomas King's assertion that the "truth about stories is that that's all we are" (2), Tarc argues that we are "storied" creatures who internalize the narratives communicated to us, and that narrative "supports our capacity to act and be in relation to others and the world" (12-13). As discussed in the Introduction, de Certeau considers reading a tactic that removes passivity and acknowledges agency. For de Certeau, reading is a tactic that enables active living and functions as a method of resistance against the net of discipline. Reading school stories is an everyday practice and tactic that produces without exploiting (de Certeau xx), and in which readers can "combin[e] . . . fragments and creates

something un-known in the space organized by their capacity for allowing an indefinite plurality of meanings" (de Certeau 169). From reading school stories, children and youth can internalize narratives that communicate certain expectations of students' behaviours and movements within school spaces that informs their "capacity to act" in relation to others. The type of school stories read, conservative or radical, can directly affect how children and youth comprehend the limits of their actions within school spaces and what type of "storied" students they can be.

Combined with the tactic of reading is Sara Ahmed's assertion that narratives are sticky, and the emotionality of a text can impress upon, and change, the reader. A character's feelings of pride, anger, or sense of injustice with his or her school experience can stick to and impress upon readers' bodies to influence their own affective responses to institutionalized education. School stories that feature oppressive spaces revise the dominant narratives of institutionalized education cemented by the Golden Age public-school story, and Tarc argues that revising dominant narratives "alters the meanings of humanity and revitaliz[e] the experience of being human" (13). Many of the school stories examined in this study demonstrate creative ways for children and youth to live actively in their school spaces, and as is the case with many of the March for Our Lives organizers and protesters, readers can appropriate the emotionality expressed in the school stories in revolutionary ways by turning the impressed emotionality into action.

The subversive and revolutionary attitudes demonstrated by characters in this study can encourage readers to adopt the characters' integration into politics. The active living of characters in their school spaces demonstrates to readers that young people are capable of reforming their societies, and this opens many possibilities in young people's reading of school stories, as well as children's and YA literature more generally, and casts this reading as a profoundly political act that can resist the net of discipline. This type of creative reading that impresses upon the body of

the reader was modelled in the *Loom of Youth*, based on Alec Waugh's own tactic of "ordinary" creative reading practices and by youth organizers of the March for Our Lives movement. Both Waugh and the youth activists are impressed upon by the emotionality in school stories, and their surfaces have been changed by reading school stories to move creatively and actively in the spaces of their societies in ways that attempt to transform power structures that actively deny them participation.

I conclude this dissertation with a brief discussion of seven-year-old Havana Chapman-Edwards who displays the mounting impact that resistive and creative reading practices, especially of school stories, can afford. Chapman-Edwards caught the attention of several media outlets during the 20 April 2018 National School Walkout organized by the youth-led March for Our Lives organization. During the National School Walkout, thousands of students across the United States walked out of their schools for seventeen minutes, a minute for each of the Stoneman Douglas High School shooting victims, to protest "congressional, state, and local failures to take action to prevent gun violence" ("Who We Are"). Although Chapman-Edward's elementary school in Alexandria, Virginia, did not make plans to partake in the walkout, the first grader was eager to participate (Mezzofiore). Her mother signed Chapman-Edwards out of school, and she stood in protest alone (Mezzofiore). Chapman-Edwards shared a picture of her solitary protest on her Twitter feed (Figure 2), and captioned the photo, "I am all alone at my school, but I know I am not alone" (@TheTinyDiplomat, "Alone"). In an interview with *CNN*, Chapman-Edwards explained that she felt it was important to protest in order to improve the safety of hers, and others', schools: "girls and boys should be able to do math and science and not worry about people trying to hurt them" (Chapman-Edwards qtd. in Mezzofiore).

Figure 2. @TheTinyDiplomat. “I am all alone at my school, but I know I am not alone.” *Twitter*, 20 Apr. 2018.

Several news sources picked up the story and expressed admiration not only for her dedication but also that Chapman-Edwards is politically involved at her young age (Gontcharova for *Refinery 29*; Mezzofiore for *CNN*; Rearick for *Teen Vogue*; Villacis for *ABC news*; Ellison for the *Washington Post*; and Thomsen for *The Hill*). Chapman-Edwards was invited to speak at the National Die-In Day in Washington D.C., where protesters gathered to call for “common-sense gun laws, like banning assault weapons, universal background checks, and keeping guns out of the hands of domestic violence perpetrators” (Gontcharova). In her speech, Chapman-Edwards defended her political engagement against any adults who may claim she is too young by saying, “Just because I’m only seven doesn’t mean I can’t help change the laws. There are adults that keep saying that kids don’t know what we are talking about. But we know we are never too little to make a difference” (@TheTinyDiplomat, “Speech”). Chapman-Edwards refuses to be contained and confined by the debilitating Western belief that childhood is only a time of becoming, and that

young peoples' value lie exclusively in their future adult contributions. Instead, Chapman-Edwards lives actively by engaging in political life and making contributions in the present, the importance of which she expressed succinctly herself with the following anonymously attributed quote she posted in her *Twitter* feed:

> We, as young people, need to have a paradigm shift—a shift from thinking that our efforts make little to no impact or the narrative that "youth are the leaders of tomorrow." No! Let's reject that narrative. We are the leaders of today. (@TheTinyDiplomat, "Leaders")

Alongside her protests, Chapman-Edwards began a book club, "Rhymes and Readers: 37 Books," that provides children in her community "books with characters that reflect and inspire them" (Gontcharova). Chapman-Edwards explains that statistically African American children have thirty-seven fewer books in their libraries than their white peers (Gontcharova), and Chapman-Edwards seeks to close this disparity while simultaneously sharing books that are both mirrors and maps. As discussed in Chapter Six, Christopher Myers argues that books are mirrors, and for a reader to recognize themselves in books tells the reader "you are worthy of being told, thought about, discussed and even celebrated" (C. Myers); and books are also maps and provide readers "an atlas of their world, of their relationships to others, of their possible destinations" (C. Myers). For Chapman-Edwards, whose own love of reading has inspired her reading club, I find it no coincidence that her two favourite books/series are school stories: Chapman-Edwards cites *Each Kindness* by Jacqueline Woodson which "teaches you how to be kind and generous to new kids when they come to your school" (Chapman-Edwards qtd. in Summers), and Kelly Starling Lyons's *Jada Jones* school story series as her favourite books (Gontcharova). Chapman-Edwards reads school stories that invite children's political participation (most directly in *Jada Jones: Class Act* [2017] where Jada runs for school president), and that provide Chapman-Edwards a complex

understanding of the ways race, gender, economics, and other variables structure her and her peers' lives and have convinced her of the importance of being integrated in political life.

Chapman-Edwards embodies the potential for school stories, including those considered in this study, not only to function as time capsules for their contemporary crises and values, but also to function as texts of resistance that alter the meaning and experience of being a student for children and youth. Through reading, ordinary and everyday lived spaces become defamiliarized for children and youth, prompting them to consider the ideological structures that order and control their lives. In apprehending structures, which Lefebvre noted are not constructed by those in power to be easily comprehended, children and youth can embark on a critical and autonomous self-education (as modelled in Chapter Two) of the structural organizations of their societies. School stories are always political texts because education is central to politics and power, and pedagogy is concerned with determining and propagating certain modes and levels of agency. School stories that feature oppressive spaces are political texts that make evident institutionalized education's centrality to politics, and this transparency invites readers to critically consider the structures of their school spaces. The student protagonists' varied acts of resistance and rebellion imagine children and youth as being capable of interceding in these structures in order to evade, resist, rebel against, or reform them. This imagining has the potential to stick to readers' bodies, change their surfaces, and have their emotionality turned into revolutionary action.

Works Cited

Primary Sources

Albertalli, Becky. *Simon vs. the Homo Sapiens Agenda*. Balzer + Bray, 2015.

Alexie, Sherman. *The Absolutely True Diary of a Part-Time Indian*. Little, Brown Books for Young Readers, 2007.

American Pie. Directed by Paul Weitz and Chris Weitz, performances by Jason Biggs, Chris Klein, Tara Reid, Mena Suvari, and Eugene Levy, Universal Pictures, 1999.

Asher, Jay. *Th1rteen R3asons Why*. Razorbill, 2007.

Atwood, Margaret. *The Handmaid's Tale*. McClelland and Stewart, 1985.

Avery, Harold. *Frank's First Term; or, Making a Man of Him*. T Nelson and Sons, 1898.

---. *The Head of the School*. Musson Book Company, 1912.

---. *Soldiers of the Queen*. Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1898. *Project Gutenberg*, gutenberg.org/files/29415/29415-h/29415-h.htm#chap09.

Bell, Cece. *El Deafo*. Amulet, 2014.

Bertagna, Julie. *Exodus*. Pan Macmillan, 2002.

Blume, Judy. *Blubber*. Bradbury, 1974.

---. *It's Not the End of the World*. Bradbury, 1972.

---. *Tales of a Fourth Grade Nothing*. Dutton, 1972.

Blyton, Enid. *Malory Towers Series*. Methuen, 1946-51.

---. *The Naughtiest Girl Again*. Newnes, 1942.

---. *The Naughtiest Girl is a Monitor*. Newnes, 1944.

---. *The Naughtiest Girl in the School*. Newnes, 1940.

---. *St. Clare's Series*. Methuen, 1941-45.

---. *Fifth Formers of St. Clare's*. Methuen, 1945.

Braithwaite, Allyson. *Crossed*. Dutton Juvenile, 2011.

---. *Matched*. Dutton Juvenile, 2010.

---. *Reached*. Dutton Juvenile, 2012.

Brazil, Angela. *The Fortunes of Philippa: A School Story*. 1907. *Project Gutenberg*, ia600500.us.archive.org/16/items/thefortunesofphi33387gut/33387-8.txt

---. *A Patriotic Schoolgirl*. Blackie & Son, 1916. *Internet Archive*, ia800308.us.archive.org/14/items/apatrioticschool25145gut/25145-8.txt.

Brent-Dyer, Elinor M. *Chalet School Series*. Chambers, 1925-70.

---. *La Rochelle Series*. Chambers, 1922-53.

Brown, Jennifer. *Hate List*. Little Brown Books for Young Readers, 2009.

Browne, Martin. *A Dream of Youth, an Etonian's Reply to "*The Loom of Youth*."* Longmans, Green and Co, 1919. *Internet Archives*, archive.org/details/dreamofyoutheton00browuoft.

Bruce, Dorita Fairlie. *Dimsie Among the Prefects*. Oxford UP, 1924.

---. *The Dimsie Series*. Oxford UP, 1920-46.

Burnett, Frances Hodgson. *A Little Princess*. 1905. Puffin, 2008.

Campbell, Nicola. *Shi-shi-etko*. Illustrated by Kim Lafave, Groundwood, 2005.

---. *Shin-chi's Canoe*. Illustrated by Kim LaFave, Groundwood, 2008.

Card, Orson Scott. *Children of the Fleet*. Tor, 2017.

---. *Ender's Game*. 1977. Starscape, 2002.

---. *Ender's Shadow*. 1999. Tor, 2013.

Carroll, Lewis. *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland*. 1865. Dover P, 1993.

Carrie. Directed by Brain De Palma, performance by Sissy Spacek, United Artists, 1972.

Carrie. Directed by Kimberly Peirce, performances by Chloe Grace Moretz and Julianne Moore, Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer Pictures, 2013.

Charbonneau, Joelle. *Independent Study*. Houghton Mifflin Harcourt, 2014. iBook.

---. *Graduation Day*. Houghton Mifflin Harcourt, 2014. iBook.

---. *The Testing*. Houghton Mifflin Harcourt, 2013.

Chmakova, Svetlana. *Awkward*. Yen Press, 2015.

---. *Brave*. Yen Press, 2017.

---. *Crush*. Yen Press, 2018.

Clueless. Directed by Amy Herkerling, performances by Alicia Silverstone and Paul Rudd, Paramount Pictures, 1995.

Coolidge, Susan. *What Katy Did at School*. 1872. *Project Gutenberg*, gutenberg.org/cache/epub/5141/pg5141-images.html.

Collins, Suzanne. *Catching Fire*. Scholastic, 2009.

---. *The Hunger Games*. Scholastic, 2008.

---. *Mockingjay*. Scholastic, 2010.

Cormier, Robert. *Beyond the Chocolate War*. Laurel Leaf, 1986.

---. *The Chocolate War*. 1975. Ember, 2004.

Crate, Joan. *Black Apple*. Simon & Schuster, 2016.

Cross, Gillian. *The Demon Headmaster*. 1982. Oxford UP, 2017.

Darch, Winifred. *Heather at the High School*. Oxford UP, 1924.

---. *The New School and Hilary*. Oxford UP, 1926.

---. *Poppies and Prefects*. Oxford UP, 1923.

---. *The School on the Cliff*. Illustrated by M. D. Johnston, Oxford UP, 1933.

---. *The Upper Fifth in Command*. 1928. *The Winifred Darch Omnibus*, Oxford UP, 1938.

Dashner, James. *The Death Cure*. Delacorte P, 2011.

---. *The Maze Runner*. Delacorte P, 2009.

---. *The Scorch Trails*. Delacorte P, 2010.

Degrassi High. Created by Linda Schuyler and Kit Hood, CBC Television, 1989-91.

Degrassi Junior High. Created by Linda Schuyler and Kit Hood, CBC Television, 1987-89.

Degrassi: The Next Class. Created by Created by Yan Moore and Linda Schuyler, Entertainment One, 2016-present.

Degrassi: *The Next Generation*. Created by Yan Moore and Linda Schuyler, Entertainment One, 2001-15.

Draper, Sharon. M. *Out of My Mind*. Atheneum, 2010.

Dupuis, Jenny Kay, and Kathy Kacer. *I Am Not A Number*. Illustrated by Gillian Newland, Second Story P, 2016.

Edgeworth, Maria. "The Barring Out; or, Party Spirit." *The Parent's Assistant; or Stories for Children*. 1796. George Routledge and Sons, 1891, *Project Gutenberg*, gutenberg.org/files/3655/3655-h/3655-h.htm.

Election. Directed by Alexander Payne, performances by Reese Witherspoon and Matthew Broderick, Paramount Pictures, 1999.

Fantastic Beasts: The Crimes of Grindelwald. Directed by David Yates, performances by Eddie Redmayne, Jude Law, and Johnny Depp, Warner Bros. Pictures, 16 Nov. 2018.

Fantastic Beasts and Where to Find Them. Directed by David Yates, performances by Eddie Redmayne and Ezra Miller, Warner Bros. Pictures, 18 Nov. 2016.

Farrar, F.W. *Eric; or, Little by Little*. Adam & Charles Black, 1858, *Project Gutenberg*, gutenberg.org/files/12083/12083-h/12083-h.htm.

Fenton, Christy, and Margaret Pokiak-Fenton. *Fatty Legs: A True Story*. Illustrated by Liz Amini-Holmes, Annick, 2010.

---. *A Stranger at Home*. Illustrated by Liz Amini-Holmes, Annick, 2011.

---. *Not My Girl*. Illustrated by Gabrielle Grimard, Annick, 2014.

---. *When I Was Eight*. Illustrated by Gabrielle Grimard, Annick, 2013.

Fielding, Sarah. *The Governess, Or, the Little Female Academy.* 1749. Dodo, 2007.

Flake, Sharon G. *The Skin I'm In.* Jump at the Sun, 1998.

Florence, Melanie. *Stolen Words*. Illustrated by Gabrielle Grimard, Second Story P, 2017.

Forest, Antonia. *Autumn Term*. Puffin Books, 1948.

Garden, Nancy. *Endgame*. Graphia, 2006.

Glee. Created by Ryan Murphy, Brad Falchuk, and Ian Brennan, performances by Lea Michele and Cory Monteith, 20th Television, 2009-15.

Green, John. *Looking for Alaska*. 2005. Speak, 2008.

Hadath, Gunby. *Fall In!: A Public School Story*. Patridge, 1916.

---. *Won by a Try*. Cassell and Company, 1922.

Hale, Shannon. *Real Friends*. Illustrated by LeUyen Pham, First Second, 2017.

The Handmaid's Tale. Created by Bruce Miller, performances by Elisabeth Moss and Joseph Fiennes, Hulu, 26 April 2017.

Hanni & Nanni. Directed by Christine Hartmann, Universal Pictures International, 2010.

Harry Potter and the Chamber of Secrets. Directed by Chris Columbus, performances by Daniel Radcliffe, Rupert Grint, and Emma Watson, Warner Bros. Pictures, 3 Nov. 2002.

Harry Potter and the Deathly Hallows Part 1. Directed by David Yates, performances by Daniel Radcliffe, Rupert Grint, and Emma Watson, Warner Bros. Pictures, 11 Nov. 2010.

Harry Potter and the Deathly Hallows Part 2. Directed by David Yates, performances by Daniel Radcliffe, Rupert Grint, and Emma Watson, Warner Bros. Pictures, 7 July 2011.

Harry Potter and the Goblet of Fire. Directed by Mike Newell, performances by Daniel Radcliffe, Rupert Grint, and Emma Watson, Warner Bros. Pictures, 6 Nov. 2005.

Harry Potter and the Half-Blood Prince. Directed by David Yates, performances by Daniel Radcliffe, Rupert Grint, and Emma Watson, Warner Bros. Pictures, 6 July 2009.

Harry Potter and the Order of the Phoenix. Directed by David Yates, performances by Daniel Radcliffe, Rupert Grint, and Emma Watson, Warner Bros. Pictures, 28 June 2007.

Harry Potter and the Philosopher's Stone. Directed by Chris Columbus, performances by Daniel Radcliffe, Rupert Grint, and Emma Watson, Warner Bros. Pictures, 16 Nov. 2001.

Harry Potter and the Prisoner of Azkaban. Directed by Alfonso Cuarón, performances by Daniel Radcliffe, Rupert Grint, and Emma Watson, Warner Bros. Pictures, 22 May 2004.

Heathers. Directed by Michael Lehmann, performances by Winona Ryder and Christian Slater, New World Pictures, 1989.

Hood, Jack. *The Heart of a Schoolboy*. Longmans, Green and Co, 1919. *Internet Archive*, archive.org/details/heartofschoolboy00hoodrich.

Horowitz, Anthony. *Groosham Grange*. Walker Books, 1988.

---. *Return to Groosham Grange*: *The Unholy Grail*. Walker Books, 2003.

Howe, James. *Addie on the Inside*. Atheneum, 2011.

---. *Also Known as Elvis*. Atheneum, 2014.

---. *The Misfits*. Atheneum, 2001.

---. *Totally Joe*. Atheneum, 2005.

Hughes, John, director. *The Breakfast Club*. Universal Pictures, 1985.

---. *Ferris Bueller's Day Off*. Paramount Pictures, 1986.

---. *Sixteen Candles*. Universal Pictures, 1984.

Hughes, Thomas. *Tom Brown's School Days*. 1857. Edited by Andrew Sanders, Oxford UP, 1999.

Jawbreakers. Directed by Darren Stein, performances by Rose McGowan, Rebecca Gayheart, and Julie Benz, Tristar Pictures, 1999.

Jones, Diana Wynne. *Witch Week*. Macmillian, 1982.

The Kids of Degrassi Street. Created by Linda Schuyler, CBC Television, 1979-86.

Kincaid, S. J. *Catalyst*. Katherine Tegan Books, 2014.

---. *Insignia*. Katherine Tegan Books, 2012.

---. *Vortex*. Katherine Tegan Books, 2013.

King, Stephen. *Carrie*. Doubleday, 1974.

King, Thomas. *The Truth about Stories*. Anansi P, 2011. *EBL*, reader.eblib.com/(S(q13zzeyilmdhw0kdjidgelqb))/Reader.aspx?p=744696&o=266&u=4291dc1e6e0c3092429c62b106acd598&t=1484169204&h=51CA376FA0CB9450A6368C030B89F32BBB2F0D0D&s=52211512&ut=823&pg=1&r=img&c=-1&pat=n&cms=-1&sd=2#.

Kipling, Rudyard. *Stalky & Co.* Doubleday and McClure, 1899.

Knowles, John. *A Separate Peace*. Secker & Warburg, 1959.

---. *Peace Breaks Out.* Bantam Books, 1981.

Leslie, Shane. *The Oppidan*. Chatto & Windus, 1969.

Lloyd, Joanna. *Jane Runs Away from School*. Blackie & Sons, 1946.

Lunn, Arnold. *The Harrovians: A Tale of Public School Life*. 1914. Viewforth P, 2010.

Lyons, Kelly Starling. *Jada Jones: Class Act*. Illustrated by Vanessa Brantley-Newton, Penguin Workshop, 2017.

---. *Jada Jones: Rock Star*. Illustrated by Vanessa Brantley-Newton, Penguin Workshop, 2017.

Marlow, Veronica. *For the Sake of the House*. Oxford UP, 1933.

May, E. J. *Louis's School Days; A Story for Boys*. D. Appleton, 1852. *Project Gutenberg*, gutenberg.org/files/19855/19855-h/19855-h.htm.

Meade, L. T. *A World of Girls: The Story of a School.* 1886. A. L. Burt. *Project Gutenberg,* ia600503.us.archive.org/0/items/aworldofgirlsthe25870gut/25870-8.txt.

---. *The Rebel of the School*. 1914. Yurita P, 2015.

Mean Girls. Directed by Mark Waters, performances by Lindsay Lohan, Rachel McAdams, and Tina Fey, Paramount Pictures, 2004.

Mischievous Twins: The Tales of St. Clare's. Directed by Masaharu Okuwaki, Tokyo Movie Shinsha, 5 Jan. 1991.

Moore, Michael, director. *Bowling for Columbine*. United Artists and Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer, 2002.

Murphy, Jill. *The Worst Witch*. Allison & Busby, 1974.

---. *The Worst Witch Series*. Allison & Busby, 1974-2013.

Myers, Walter Dean. *Shooter*. HarperCollins e-books, 2004.

Ness, Patrick. *The Rest of Us Just Live Here*. Harper Teen, 2015.

Never Been Kissed. Directed by Raja Gosnell, performances by Drew Barrymore and David Arquette, 20th Century Fox, 1999.

Oxenham, Elsie J. *Abbey Series*. Collins, 1920-59.

---. *The Rockland Books*. Chambers and Collins, 1919-31.

Palacio, R.J. *Wonder*. Knoff, 2012.

Pascal, Francine, creator. *Sweet Valley High*. Random House, 1983-2003.

Patterson, James, and Chris Tebbetts. *Middle School: Get Me Out of Here*. Little, Brown and Company, 2012.

---, and Laura Park. *Middle School: How I Survived Bullies, Broccoli, and Snake Hill*. Little, Brown and Company, 2013.

---. *Middle School: The Worst Years of My Life*. Little, Brown and Company, 2011.

---, and Lisa Papademetriou. *Middle School: My Brother is a Big, Fat Liar*. Little, Brown and Company, 2013.

---, and Julia Bergen. *Middle School: Ultimate Showdown*. Little, Brown and Company, 2014.

Picoult, Jodi. *Nineteen Minutes*. Kindle ed., Atria Books, 2007.

Pignat, Caroline. *Shooter: This is Not a Drill*. Razorbill, 2016.

Quick, Matthew. *Every Exquisite Thing*. Little, Brown and Company, 2016.

Reed, Talbot Baines. *The Adventures of a Three-Guinea Watch*. *Boys Own Paper*, 1880-1881.

---. *A Dog with a Bad Name*. 1894. *Internet Archive,* archive.org/details/TB_Reed_A_Dog_with_a_Bad_Name.

---. *The Fifth Form at St. Dominic's*. Religious Tract Society, 1887.

---. *My Friend Smith*. 1889. *Internet Archive*, archive.org/details/TB_Reed_My_Friend_Smith.

---. *The Parkhurst Boys, and Other Stories of School Life*. 1880. *Internet Archive*, archive.org/details/TB_Reed_Parkhurst_Boys.

Riverdale. Developed by Roberto Aguirre-Sacasa, Warner Bros. Television, 2017-present.

Robertson, David A. *When We Were Alone*. Illustrated by Julie Flett, Highwater P, 2016.

---. *Sugar Falls: A Residential School Story*. Illustrated by Scott B Henderson, Highwater P, 2011.

---. *7 Generations: A Plains Cree Saga*. Illustrated by Scott B. Henderson, Highwater P, 2012.

Rowling, J.K. *The Chamber of Secrets*. Raincoast Books, 1998.

---. *The Chamber of Secrets Illustrated Edition*. Illustrated by Jim Kay, Bloomsbury, 2016.

---, John Tiffany, and Jack Thorne. *Harry Potter and the Cursed Child: Parts One and Two*. Arthur A. Levine, 2016.

---. *The Deathly Hallows*. Raincoast Books, 2007.

---. *The Goblet of Fire*. Raincoast Books, 2000.

---. *The Half-Blood Prince*. Raincoast Books, 2005.

---. *The Order of the Phoenix*. Raincoast Books, 2003.

---. *The Philosopher's Stone*. Raincoast Books, 1997.

---. *The Philosopher's Stone Illustrated Edition.* Illustrated by Jim Kay, Bloomsbury, 2015.

---. *The Prisoner of Azkaban*. Raincoast Books, 1999.

---. *The Prisoner of Azkaban Illustrated Edition*. Illustrated by Jim Kay, Bloomsbury, 2017.

Saved by the Bell. Created by Sam Bobrick, performances by Mario Lopez, Mark-Paul Gosselaar, Dustin Diamond, and Tiffani-Amber Thiessen, Rysher Entertainment, 1989-1993.

Scelsa, Kate. *Fans of the Impossible Life*. Blazer + Bray, 2015.

She's All That. Directed by Robert Iscove, performances by Freddie Prince Jr. and Rachael Leigh Cook, Miramax Films, 1999.

Shepard, Jim. *Project X*. Kindle ed., Vintage Contemporaries, 2004.

Shriver, Lionel. *We Need to Talk About Kevin*. Harper Perennial, 2003.

Slipperjack, Ruby. *These Are My Words: The Residential School Diary of Violet Pesheens*. Scholastic Canada, 2016.

Smith, Neil. *Boo*. Vintage Canada, 2016.

Spinelli, Jerry. *Fourth Grade Rats*. Scholastic, 1991.

---. *The Library Card*. Scholastic, 1997.

---. *Loser*. Harper Collins, 2003.

---. *Report to the Principal's Office*. Scholastic, 1991.

---. *Space Station Seventh Grade*. Little, Brown and Company, 1982.

---. *Stargirl*. Scholastic, 2000.

---. *Third Grade Angels*. Scholastic, 2012.

---. *Who Ran My Underwear Up the Flagpole*? Scholastic, 1992.

Stone, Tamera Ireland. *Every Last Word*. Hyperion, 2015.

Strasser, Todd. *Give a Boy a Gun*. Kindle ed., Simon Pulse, 2000.

Sterling, Shirley. *My Name is Seepeetza*. Groundwood Books, 1998.

Thomas, Angie. *The Hate U Give*. HarperCollins, 2017.

Tullson, Diana. *Lockdown*. Kindle ed., Ocra Books, 2008.

Van Sant, Gus, director. *Elephant*. HBO Films, 2003.

Waugh, Alec. *The Loom of Youth*. 1917. Pantianos Classics, n.d.

---. *Public School Life: Boys, Parents, Masters*. W. Collins, 1922. *Internet Archive*, archive.org/stream/publicschoollife00waug#page/n5/mode/2up.

Westerfeld, Scott. *Pretties*. Simon Pulse, 2006.

---. *Specials*. Simon Pulse, 2007.

---. *The Uglies*. Simon Pulse, 2005.

Woodson, Jacqueline. *Each Kindness*. Illustrated by E. B. Lewis, Nancy Paulsen Books, 2012.

Wolitzer, Meg. *Belzhar*. Dutton, 2014.

Yang, Gene Luen. *American Born Chinese*. First Second, 2006.

Yolen, Jane. *Wizard's Hall.* Harcourt, 1991.

10 Things I Hate About You. Directed by Gil Junger, performances by Julia Stiles, Heath Ledger, and Joseph Gordon-Levitt, Touchstone Pictures, 1999.

13 Reasons Why. Created by Brian Yorkey and Diana Son, performances by Dylan Minnette and Katherine Langford, Netflix, 31 March 2017.

Secondary Sources

Agnew, Kate, and Geoff Fox. *Children at War: From the First World War to the Gulf.* Continuum, 2001.

Ahmed, Sara. *The Promise of Happiness*. Duke UP, 2010.

---. *The Cultural Politics of Emotion*. Edinburgh UP, 2014.

Alexander, Jonathan, and Rebecca Black. "The Darker Side of the Sorting Hat: Representations of Educational Testing in Dystopian Young Adult Fiction." *Children's Literature* vol. 43, 2015, pp. 209-234.

Alfonsi, Sharyn. "Students Calling for Change After the Parkland Shooting." *CBS News: 60 Minutes*, 18 Mar. 2018, cbsnews.com/news/parkland-shooting-students-calling-for-change-60-minutes-interview.

Altbach, Philip G., and Gail P. Kelly. *Education and Colonialism*. Longman P Group, 1987.

Anatol, Liza Giselle. "Introduction." *Reading Harry Potter*. Edited by Giselle Lisa Anatol, Praeger, 2003, pp. ix-xxv.

---. "The Fallen Empire: Exploring Ethnic Otherness in the World of Harry Potter." *Reading Harry Potter*. Edited by Giselle Lisa Anatol, Praeger, 2003, pp. 163-78.

Anderson, Hephzibah. "How Harry Potter Became a Rallying Cry." *BBC Culture*, 26 Mar. 2018, bbc.com/culture/story/20180326-the-links-between-harry-potter-and-millennial-protest

"Annual Report 2014-2015." *Commonwealth War Grave Initiative*, 2015, issuu.com/wargravescommission/docs/ar_2014-2015?e=4065448/31764375.

Armstrong, Rachel. "Sexual Geometry of the Golden Trio: Hermione's Subversion of Traditional Female Subject Positions." *Wizard of Their Age: Critical Essays from the Harry Potter Generation*. Edited by Cecilia Konchar Farr, U of New York P, 2015, pp. 235-50, *ProQuest*, ebookcentral-proquest-com.ezproxy.lib.ucalgary.ca/lib/ucalgary-ebooks/reader.action?docID=3408987&query=.

Aronowitz, Stanely. "Essay on Violence." *Smoke and Mirrors: The Hidden Context of Violence in Schools and Society*. Edited by Stephanie Urso Spina, Rowman & Littlefield P, 2000, pp. 211-28.

Auchmuty, Rosemary. *The World of Girls*. The Women's P, 1992.

---. "School Stories." *The Oxford Encyclopedia of Children's Literature*. Edited by Jack Zipes, Oxford UP, 2006, *Oxford Reference*, www.oxfordreference.com/view/10.1093/acref/9780195146561.001.0001/acref-9780195146561-e-2885?rskey=MUQoUc&result=2861.

Barczewski, Stephanie. *Myth and National Identity in Nineteenth-Century Britain: The Legends of King Arthur and Robin Hood*. Oxford UP, 2000.

Basu, Balaka, Katherine R. Broad, and Carrie Hintz, editors. *Contemporary Dystopian Fiction for Young Adults: Brave New Teenagers*. Taylor and Francis, 2013, *ProQuest Ebrary*, ebookcentral.proquest.com.ezproxy.lib.ucalgary.ca/lib/ucalgary-ebooks/detail.action?docID=1186446.

---. "What Faction Are You In? The Pleasure of Being Sorted in Veronica Roth's Divergent." *Contemporary Dystopian Fiction for Young Adults: Brave New Teenagers*. Edited by Balaka Basu, Katherine R.Broad, and Carrie Hintz, Taylor and Francis, 2013, pp. 19-33, *ProQuest Ebrary*, ebookcentral.proquest.com.ezproxy.lib.ucalgary.ca/lib/ucalgary-ebooks/detail.action?docID=1186446.

Bellrichard, Chantelle. "10 Books about Residential Schools to Read with Your Kids." *CBC news*, Canadian Broadcast Corporation, 27 Sep. 2015, cbc.ca/news/indigenous/10-books-about-residential-schools-to-read-with-your-kids-1.3208021.

Bertagna, Julie. "Books: Why Are Teenagers Such Avid Readers of Books About Dystopia?" *The Scotsman*, 30 May 2011, scotsman.com/lifestyle/books-why-are-teenagers-such-avid-readers-of-books-about-dystopias-1-1667196.

Bevis, William. "Native American Novels: Homing In." *Recovering the Word: Essays on Native American Literature*. Edited by Brain Swann and Arnold Krupat, U of California P, 1987.

Byler, Lauren. "Makeovers, Individualism, and Vanishing Community in the *Harry Potter* Series." Children's Literature, vol. 44, 2016, pp. 115-46, *Project Muse*, doi.org/10.1353/chl.2016.0008.

Book Sniffing Fangirl. "The Importance of Young Adult Dystopian Literature." *YouTube*, 21 Nov. 2015, youtube.com/watch?v=hBEQ1Y-OhY4.

Bourdieu, Pierre. *The Logic of Practice*. 1980. Translated by Richard Nice, Polity Press, 1990.

---. *Language and Symbolic Power*. Polity P, 1992. *Social Theory*, soth-alexanderstreet-com.ezproxy.lib.ucalgary.ca//cgi-bin/asp/philo/soth/sourceidx.pl?sourceid=S10023879&showfullrecord=on.

Bradford, Clare. *Unsettling Narratives: Postcolonial Readings of Children's Literature*. Wilfrid Laurier UP, 2007. *Scholars Portal Books*, books1.scholarsportal.info/viewdoc.html?id=/ebooks/ebooks0/gibson_crkn/2009-12-01/5/411203#tabview=tab1.

---, Kerry Mallan, John Stephens, and Robyn McCallum. *New World Orders in Contemporary Children's Literature: Utopian Transformations*. Palgrave MacMillan, 2008.

Bradley, Laura. "Dumbledore Won't be Explicitly Gay in *Fantastic Beasts 2*—But Why?" *Vanity Fair*, 31 Jan. 2018, vanityfair.com/hollywood/2018/01/dumbledore-fantastic-beasts-explicitly-gay.

"Bully, n.1, II. 3. A." *Oxford English Dictionary*, 2018. Oxford UP, oed.com.ezproxy.library.yorku.ca/search?searchType=dictionary&q=bully&_searchBtn=Search.

"Bullying, n." *Oxford English Dictionary*, 2018. Oxford UP, oed.com.ezproxy.library.yorku.ca/view/Entry/24610?rskey=nXrxhT&result=1#eid.

Cadden, Mike. "The Irony of Narration in the Young Adult Novel." *Children's Literature Association Quarterly*, vol. 25, no. 3, Fall 2000, pp. 146-54.

Cantrell, Sarah K. "'I Solemnly Swear I am up to no Good': Foucault's Heterotopias and Deleuze's Any-Spaces-Whatever in J. K. Rowling's Harry Potter Series." *Children's Literature*, vol. 29, 2011, pp. 195-212, *Project Muse*, doi.org/10.1353/chl.2011.0012.

Cart, Michael. *Young Adult Literature: From Romance to Realism*. American Library Association, 2010.

Caruk, Holly. "New Book Aims to Teach Children About Painful History of Residential Schools." *CBC news*, Canadian Broadcast Corporation, 13 Jan. 2017, cbc.ca/news/canada/manitoba/childrens-book-residential-schools-1.3933148.

Cech, John. "Some Leading, Blurred, and Violent Edges of the Contemporary Picturebook." *Children's Literature*, vol. 15, 1987, pp. 197-206.

@CharlotteAlter. "Harry Potter has almost become their playbook: the Ones Who Lived fighting an "evil" force that has infiltrated the government and brainwashed adults using only the powers they've learned in school: illumination, protection, disarmament." *Twitter*, 24 Mar. 2018, 7:01 a.m., twitter.com/CharlotteAlter/status/977545917527072770.

Chartrand, Vicki. "Broken System: Why is a Quarter of Canada's Prison Population Indigenous?" *The Conversation*, 18 Feb. 2018, theconversation.com/broken-system-why-is-a-quarter-of-canadas-prison-population-indigenous-91562.

Chellman, Jack. "The Gay Romance in *The Cursed Child*: A Letter to JK Rowling." *Huffington Post*, 4 Aug. 2016, huffingtonpost.com/entry/the-gay-romance-in-the-cursed-child-a-letter-to-jk_us_57a2a99de4b0c863d4002748.

Cherland, Meredith. "Harry's Girls: *Harry Potter* and the Discourse of Gender." *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literary*, vol. 54, no. 4, 2008, pp. 273-82.

Chevalier, Noel. "The Liberty Tree and the Whomping Willow: Political Justice, Magical Sceince, and Harry Potter." *The Lion and the Unicorn*, vol. 29, no. 3, 2005, pp. 397-415, *Project Muse*, doi.org/10.1353/uni.2005.0041.

Chrisjohn, Roland, and Tanya Wasacase. "Half-Truths and Whole Lies: Rhetoric in the 'Apology' and The Truth and Reconciliation Commission." *Response, Responsibility, and Renewal: Canada's Truth and Reconciliation Journey,* edited by Gregory Youngling, Jonathan Dewar, and Mike DeGagné, Aboriginal Healing Foundation, 2009, pp. 217-32.

Church, Ward. *Kill the Indian, Save the Man: The Genocidal Impact of American Indian Residential Schools.* Preface by George E. Tinker, City Light Books, 2004.

Clare, Hillary, and Sue Sims. *The Encyclopaedia of Girls' School Stories*. Ashgate, 2000.

Clark, Beverly Lyon. *Regendering the School Story: Sassy Sissies and Tattling Tomboys*. Garland, 1996.

---, and Lavina Dhingra Shankar. "When Women Tell Tales About School." *Studies in Popular Culture*, vol. 17, no. 1, 1994, pp. 17-28, *Jstor*, jstor.org/stable/23413787.

Close, Kerry. "This is How Much Money the *Harry Potter* Movies Have Made so Far." *Time: Money*, 17 Nov. 2016, time.com/money/4574794/harry-potter-movies-money-box-office/.

Coleman, Nathaniel. *Lefebvre for Architects*. Taylor & Francis, 2014*, ProQuest*, ebookcentral-proquest-com.ezproxy.lib.ucalgary.ca/lib/ucalgary-ebooks/reader.action?docID=1883856&ppg=72.

Cullen, Dave. "'The News Forgets. Very Quickly': Inside the Marjory Stoneman Douglas Students' Incredible Race to Make History." *Vanity Fair: Hive*, 7 Mar. 2018, vanityfair.com/news/2018/03/inside-the-marjory-stoneman-douglas-students-race-to-make-history.

Cutrara, Samantha. "Deconstructing Children's History Books: Residential Schools." *ActiveHistory.ca*, U of Saskatchewan and Huron U College, 8 Dec. 2016,

http://activehistory.ca/2016/12/deconstructing-childrens-history-books-residential-schools/.

Davidson, Joyce, Liz Bondi, and Mick Smith, editors. *Emotional Geographies*. Ashgate, 2005.

Davin, Nicholas Flood. *Report on Industrial Schools for Indians and Half-Breeds*. 1879. *Early Canadiana Online*, eco.canadiana.ca.ezproxy.library.yorku.ca/view/oocihm.03651/3?r=0&s=3.

Day, Sara K., Miranda A. Green-Barteet, and Amy L. Mont, editors. *Female Rebellion in Young Adult Dystopian Fiction*. Taylor and Francis, 2014, *ProQuest Ebrary*, ebookcentral.proquest.com.ezproxy.lib.ucalgary.ca/lib/ucalgary-ebooks/detail.action?docID=1692797.

"Dean Thomas." *Fanlore*, 4 Mar. 2018, fanlore.org/wiki/Dean_Thomas#cite_note-2

"Dean Thomas." *The Harry Potter Lexicon*, edited by Jeanne Kimsey and Catherine Wilton, hp-lexicon.org/character/dean-thomas/.

DeBruyne, Nse F, and Anne Leland. "American War and Military Operations Casualties: Lists and Statistics." *Congressional Research Service*, 2 Jan. 2015, fas.org/sgp/crs/natsec/RL32492.pdf.

de Certeau, Michel. *The Practice of Everyday Life*. Translated by Steven F. Randall, U of California P, 1988.

Denmark, Florence, et al., editors. *Violence in Schools: Cross-National and Cross-cultural Perspectives*. Springer, 2005.

Doyle, Christine, and Susan Louise Steward. "Ender's Game and Ender's Shadow: Orson Scott Card's Postmodern School Stories." *The Lion and the Unicorn* vol. 28, no. 2, Apr. 2004, pp. 186-202, *Project Muse*, doi.org/10.1353/uni.2004.0018.

Dresang, Eliza T. "Hermione Granger and the Heritage of Gender." *Ivory Tower and* Harry Potter*: Perspectives on a Literary Phenomenon*, edited by Lana A. Whited, U of Missouri P, 2002, pp. 211-42, *ProQuest Ebrary*, ebookcentral-proquest-com.ezproxy.lib.ucalgary.ca/lib/ucalgary-ebooks/reader.action?docID=3570766&query=.

Duggan, Jennifer. "Revising Hegemonic Masculinity: Homosexuality, Masculinity, and Youth-Authored Harry Potter Fanfiction." *Bookbird*, vol. 55, no. 2, 2017, pp.38-45, *Project Muse*, muse.jhu.edu.ezproxy.library.yorku.ca/article/656105/pdf.

Eigenbrod, Renate. "'For the Child Taken, For the Parent Left Behind': Residential School Narratives as Act of Survivance." *ESC*, vol. 38, no.3-4, Sept./Dec. 2012, pp. 277-97.

"Endgame." *Publisher's Weekly*, 1 May 2006, publishersweekly.com/978-0-15-205416-8.

Elizabeth, De. "Best 'Harry Potter' Signs at the March for Our Lives." *TeenVogue*, 25 Mar. 2018, https://www.teenvogue.com/story/best-harry-potter-signs-march-for-our-lives.

Ellis, Rowan. "The Importance of YA Dystopian Fiction." *YouTube*, 21 Apr. 2014, youtube.com/watch?v=-V5WJnP41TY.

Ellison, Briana. "D.C. 7-Year-Old Participates in Walkout Alone, Captures Nation's Attention." *The Washington Post*, 22 Apr. 2018, washingtonpost.com/express/wp/2018/04/22/trending-d-c-7-year-old-participates-in-walkout-alone-captures-nations-attention/?noredirect=on&utm_term=.d60267367bfc.

@Emma4Change. "'We grew up on 'Harry Potter' . . . of course we're fighting back. #MarchForOurLives." *Twitter*, 25 Mar. 2018, 9:05 am., twitter.com/Emma4Change.

Episkenew, Jo-Ann. *Taking Back our Spirits: Indigenous Literature, Public Policy, and Healing*. U of Manitoba P, 2009. *Scholars Portal Books*,

books2.scholarsportal.info/viewdoc.html?id=/ebooks/ebooks3/upress/2013-08-24/1/9780887553684.

Fagan, Kristina. "What Stories Do: A Response to Episkenew." *Canadian Literature*, no. 214, Autumn 2012, pp.109-119. *Academic One File*, go.galegroup.com/ps/retrieve.do?tabID=T002&resultListType=RESULT_LIST&searchResultsType=SingleTab&searchType=AdvancedSearchForm&currentPosition=14&docId=GALE%7CA334379656&docType=Critical+essay&sort=RELEVANCE&contentSegment=&prodId=AONE&contentSet=GALE%7CA334379656&searchId=R1&userGroupName=yorku_main&inPS=true.

Farrar, Reginald. *The Life of Frederic William Farrar: Sometime Dean of Canterbury, By His Son.* James Nisbet, 1904. *Internet Archive*, archive.org/stream/lifeoffarrar00farruoft/lifeoffarrar00farruoft_djvu.txt.

Fast, Jonathan. *Ceremonial Violence: A Psychological Explanation of School Shootings.* Overlook P, 2008.

Fenton, Christy, and Margaret Pokiak-Fenton. "Indigeneity & Children's & Young Adult Literature." Roundtable 1. IRSCL 23rd Biennial Congress, 30 July 2017, York University, Toronto. Address.

Finaly, Carol. "For Indigenous Women, Prisons are the Adult Version of Residential Schools." *The Globe and Mail*, 16 May 2018, www.theglobeandmail.com/opinion/for-indigenous-women-prisons-are-the-adult-version-of-residential-schools/article29388499/.

Flam, Helena. "Introduction: Methods of Exploring Emotions." *Methods of Exploring Emotion.* Edited by Helena Flam and Jochen Kleres, Routledge, 2015, pp. 1-22.

Flett, Julie. "Illustrator Julie Flett Brings Lights to a Dark Period of History." *CBC Radio*, 15 Dec. 2017, cbc.ca/radio/unreserved/from-dystopian-futures-to-secret-pasts-check-out-these-indigenous-storytellers-over-the-holidays-1.4443312/illustrator-julie-flett-brings-light-to-a-dark-period-of-history-1.4443316.

"Florida Shooting: High School Gunman Identified as Expelled Student." *CBS Miami*, 14 Feb. 2018, miami.cbslocal.com/2018/02/14/high-school-gunman-nikolas-cruz-expelled-student/.

"For Teachers." *Wonder*, wonderthebook.com/for-teachers.

Foucault, Michel. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. 1975. Translated by Alan Sheridan. Vintage, 1995.

---. *The History of Sexuality, Vol. 1: An Introduction*. 1976. Translated by Robert Hurley. Pantheon Books, 1978.

Freire, Paulo. *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. Translated by Myra Bergman Ramos, Cotinuum, 1994.

Freya. "Brilliant." *Common Sense Media*, 21 Apr. 2015, commonsensemedia.org/users/freya.

Frostenson, Sarah. "The Women's Marches May Have Been the Largest Demonstration in US History." *Vox*, 31 Jan. 2017, vox.com/2017/1/22/14350808/womens-marches-largest-demonstration-us-history-map.

Galway, Elizabeth A. "Reminders of Rugby in the Halls of Hogwarts: The Insidious Influence of the School Story Genre on the Works of J. K. Rowling*." Children's Literature Association Quarterly,* vol. 37, no. 1, Spring 2012, pp. 66-85.

Giroux, Henry A. *America's Education Deficit and the War on Youth*. Monthly Review P, 2013.

---. “In Conversation with Henry Giroux: The Vital Role of Education in a Time of Tyranny.” *Truthout*, 11 Oct. 2017, truthout.org/articles/the-vital-role-of-education-in-a-time-of-tyranny/.

---. “Killing Children in the Age of Disposability: The Parkland Shooting Was About More Than Gun Violence.” Education & Youth, *Truthout*, 4 Mar. 2018, truthout.org/articles/killing-children-in-the-age-of-disposability-the-parkland-shooting-was-about-more-than-gun-violence/.

---. “Striking Teachers Beat Back Neoliberalism’s War on Public Schools.” Education & Youth, *Truthout*, 23 May 2018, truthout.org/articles/striking-teachers-beat-back-neoliberalism-s-war-on-public-schools/.

---. *The Violence of Forgetting: Thinking Beyond America’s Disimagination Machine*. City Light Books, 2014.

Goodnow, Cecelia. “Profits of Doom: Teen Readers Eat Up Post-Apocalyptic Tales.” *Seattle Pi*, 17 Dec. 2008, seattlepi.com/ae/books/article/Profits-of-doom-Teen-readers-eat-up-1295171.php.

Gontcharova, Natalie. “A 7-Year-Old Activist Tells Us Why She Speaks Out Against Gun Violence.” *Refinery29*, 12 June 2018, refinery29.com/2018/06/201622/havana-chapman-edwards-7-year-old-activist-pulse-shooting.

González, Emma. “Florida Student Emma Gonzáles to Lawmakers and Gun Advocates: ‘We Call BS.’” *CNN*, 17 Feb. 2018, cnn.com/2018/02/17/us/florida-student-emma-gonzalez-speech/index.html .

Gora, Susannah. *You Couldn’t Ignore Me If You Tried: The Brat Pack, John Hughes, and Their Impact on a Generation.* Crown P, 2010.

Gregg, Melissa, and Gregory J. Seigworth. "An Inventory of Shivers." *The Affect Theory Reader*, edited by Melissa Gregg and Gregory J. Seigworth, Duke UP, 2010, pp. 1-26. *ProQuest Ebrary*, http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/york/reader.action?docID=1172305&ppg=1.

Gruner, Elisabeth Rose. "Teach the Children: Education and Knowledge in Recent Children's Fantasy." *Children's Literature*, vol. 37, 2009, pp. 216-35, *Project Muse*, doi.org/10.1353/chl.0.0815.

Hanson, Aubrey Jean. "Reading for Reconciliation? Indigenous Literatures in a Post-TRC Canada." *English Studies in Canada* (ESC), vol. 43, no. 2-3, June/Sept. 2017, pp. 69-90.

Harber, Clive. *Schooling as Violence: How Schools Harm Pupils and Societies*. RoutledgeFalmer, 2004. *Ebrary*, ebrary.com/lib/oculyork/detail.action?docID=10161842.

Harjo, Joy, and Gloria Bird editors. *Reinventing the Enemy's Language: Contemporary Native Women's Writings of North America*. Norton, 1997.

Harrison, Peter. "Dispelling Ignorance of Residential Schools." *Response, Responsibility, and Renewal: Canada's Truth and Reconciliation Journey,* edited by Gregory Youngling, Jonathan Dewar, and Mike DeGagné, Aboriginal Healing Foundation, 2009.

Haskell, Rebecca, and Brian Burtch. *Get That Freak: Homophobia and Transphobia in High Schools.* Fernwood P, 2010.

Hintz, Carrie. "Monica Hughes, Lois Lowry, and Young Adult Dystopias." *The Lion and the Unicorn* vol. 26, no. 2, Apr. 2002, pp. 254-64, *Project Muse*, muse.jhu.edu/article/35550.

---, and Elaine Ostry. "Introduction" *Utopian and Dystopian Writing for Children and Young Adults*, edited by Carrie Hintz and Elaine Ostry, Routledge, 2003.

Holt, Jenny. *Public School Literature, Civic Education and the Politics of Male Adolescence*. Ashgate, 2008.

Honey, J. R. De S. *Tom Brown's Universe: The Development of the Public School in the 19th Century.* Millington, 1977.

Hopkins, Lisa. "*Harry Potter* and the Acquisition of Knowledge." *Reading Harry Potter*, edited by Giselle Lisa Anatol, Praeger, 2003, pp. 25-34.

"Horcrux." *The Harry Potter Lexicon*, edited by Leah Goldman and Jeanne Kimsey, hp-lexicon.org/thing/horcrux/.

Humphrey, Judith. *The English Girls' School Story: Subversion and Challenge in a Traditional, Conservative Literary Genre*. Academica, 2010.

Iskander, Sylvia Patterson. "Readers, Realism, and Robert Cormier." *Children's Literature*, vol. 15, 1987, pp. 7-18, *Project Muse*, muse.jhu.edu/article/246140.

Jameson, Fredric. "Globalization and Political Strategy." *New Left Review*, no. 4, 1 July 2000, pp. 49-68.

---. *The Political Unconscious: Narrative as a Socially Symbolic Act*. Cornell UP, 1981.

@jk_rowling. "Canon: brown eyes, frizzy hair and very clever. White skin was never specified. Rowling loves black Hermione." *Twitter*, 21 Dec. 2015, 2:41 a.m., twitter.com/jk_rowling/status/678888094339366914?lang=en.

Julien, Heather. "Learning to be Modern Girls: Winifred Darch's School Stories." *The Lion and the Unicorn*, vol. 32, 2008, pp.1-21.

Justice, Daniel Heath. "'Go Away, Water!': Kinship Criticism and the Decolonisation Imperative." *Reasoning Together: That Native Critics Collection*. U of Oklahoma P, 2008, pp. 147-168.

Kasky, Cameron. “Parkland Student: My Generation Won’t Stand for This.” *CNN*, 16 Feb. 2018, cnn.com/2018/02/15/opinions/florida-shooting-no-more-opinion-kasky/index.html.

Kern, Edmund. *The Wisdom of Harry Potter: What Our Favourite Hero Teaches Us About Moral Choices*. Prometheus, 2003.

Kertzer, Adrienne. *My Mother’s Voice: Children, Literature, and the Holocaust*. Broadview P, 2002.

---. “The Anxiety of Trauma in Children’s War Fiction.” *Under Fire: Childhood in the Shadow of War*, edited by Elizabeth Goodenough and Andrea Immel, Wayne State UP, 2008, pp. 207-20.

Kidd, Kenneth. “Crosswriting the School Story.” *Children’s Literature*, vol. 28, 2000, pp. 215-18, *Project Muse*, muse.jhu.edu.ezproxy.library.yorku.ca/article/246441/pdf.

---. “Outing Dumbledore.” *Children’s Literature Association Quarterly*, vol. 33, no. 2, Summer 2008, pp. 186-7, *Project Muse*, muse-jhu edu.ezproxy.library.yorku.ca/article/237888/pdf.

---. “T is for Trauma.” *Freud in Oz: At the Intersections of Psychoanalysis and Children’s Literature*. U of Minnesota P, 2011, pp. 181-206.

King, Stephen. *Danse Macabre*. 1981. Gallery Books, 2001.

Kirkpatrick, Robert J. *The Encyclopaedia of Boys’ School Stories*. Ashgate, 2000.

Kirsch, Robin J. “Degrassi Health Education Curriculum.” *WGBH-TV*, 1992, *ERIC*, files-eric-ed-gov.ezproxy.library.yorku.ca/fulltext/ED364514.pdf.

Knuth, Rebecca. *Children’s Literature and British Identity: Imagining a People and a Nation*. Scarecrow P, 2012.

Kuokkanen, Rauna. "'Survivance' in Sami and First Nations Boarding School Narratives: Reading Novels by Kerttu Vuolab and Shirley Sterling." *American Indian Quarterly*, vol. 27, no. 3-4, Summer-Autumn 2003, pp. 697-726.

Kuzmics, Helmet. "Using Fiction as Sociology: How to Analyze Emotions." *Methods of Exploring Emotion,* edited by Helena Flam and Jochen Kleres, Routledge, 2015, pp. 25-35.

LaCapra, Dominick. *Writing History, Writing Trauma*. John Hopkins UP, 2001.

---. *History in Transit: Experience, Identity, Critical Theory*. Cornell UP, 2004

Lamb, Hannah. "The Wizard, the Muggle, and the Other: Postcolonialism in *Harry Potter*." *Wizards of Their Age: Critical Essays from the Harry Potter Generation*, edited by Cecilia Konchar Farr, U of New York P, 2015, pp. 57-72*, ProQuest*, ebookcentral-proquest-com.ezproxy.lib.ucalgary.ca/lib/ucalgary-ebooks/reader.action?docID=3408987&query=.

Larkin, Ralph W. *Comprehending Columbine*. Temple UP, 2007. *ProQuest*, dc8qa4cy3n.search.serialssolutions.com/?sid=sersol&SS_jc=TC0000127428&title=Comprehending%20Columbine.

---. "The Columbine Legacy: Rampage Shootings as Political Acts." *American Behavioral Scientist*, vol. 52, no. 9. May 2009, pp. 1309-26.

Lavoie, Chantel. "Safe of Houses: Sorting and School Houses at Hogwarts." *Reading Harry Potter*, edited by Giselle Lisa Anatol, Praeger, 2003, pp. 35-49.

Lefebvre, Henri. "Preface." *Lived-in Architecture: Le Corbusier's Pessac Revisited*. Philippe Boudon, Lund Humpries, 1972.

---. *The Production of Space.* Translated by Donald Nicholson-Smith, Blackwell P, 1991.

Lepore, Jill. “A Golden Age for Dystopian Fiction.” *The New Yorker*, 5 June 2017, newyorker.com/magazine/2017/06/05/a-golden-age-for-dystopian-fiction.

Lerner, Michael. *Spirit Matters*. Hampton Roads, 2000.

Lopez-Ropero, Lourdes. “‘You are a Flaw in the Pattern’: Difference, Autonomy and Bullying in YA Fiction.” *Children’s Literature in Education* vol. 43, 2012, pp. 145-57, *Project Muse*, 10.1007/s10583-011-9145-0.

“Lunn, Sir Arnold Henry Moore.” *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, 2017, *Oxford DNB*, doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/31381.

MacDonald, Nancy. “Canada’s Prisons are the ‘New Residential Schools.’” *Maclean’s*, 18 Feb. 2016, www.macleans.ca/news/canada/canadas-prisons-are-the-new-residential-schools/.

MacLeod, Anne Scott. “Robert Cormier and the Adolescent Novel.” *Children’s Literature in Education*, vol. 11, 1981, pp. 74-81.

Mais, S. P. B. *A Public School in War Time*. John Murray, 1916. *Internet Archive*, archive.org/stream/publicschoolinwa00maisiala#page/n5/mode/2up.

Mallan, Kerry. “Everything You Do: Young Adult Fiction and Surveillance in an Age of Security.” *International Research Society for Children’s Literature*, vol. 1, no. 1, 2014, pp.1-17.

Malkin, Bonnie. “JK Rowling Reveals Dumbledore is Gay.” *The Telegraph*, 20 Oct. 2008, telegraph.co.uk/news/uknews/1566762/JK-Rowling-reveals-Dumbledore-is-gay.html.

Mann, Steven. “‘Reflectionsim’ and ‘Diffusionism’: New Tactics for Deconstructing the Video Surveillance Superhighway.” *Leonardo*, vol. 32, no. 2, 1998, pp. 93-102.

---, Jason Nolan, and Barry Wellman. "Sousveillance: Inventing and Using Wearable Computing Devices for Data Collection in Surveillance Environments." *Surveillance & Society*, no. 1, vol. 3, 2003, pp. 331-55.

Marron, Dylan. "Every Single Word Spoken by a Person of Color in the Entire Harry Potter Film Series." *YouTube*, 17 Aug. 2015, youtube.com/watch?v=x67OjOLj11g.

Masad, Ilana. "Harry Potter and the Possible Queerbaiting: Why Fans are Mad Over a Lack of Gay Romance." *The Guardian*, 15 Aug. 2016, theguardian.com/books/booksblog/2016/aug/16/harry-potter-possible-example-queerbaiting-cursed-child.

Mayes-Elam, Ruthann. *Females and* Harry Potter*: Not All That Empowering.* Rowman & Littlefield P, 2006.

McCarron, Bill. "Power vs. Authority in Harry Potter and the Order of the Phoenix." *Notes on Contemporary Literature*, vol. 34, no. 5, 2004, pp. 8-10.

McCue, Duncan. "Vancouver Daycare Teaches Toddlers about Indian Residential Schools." *CBC news*, Canadian Broadcast Corporation, 27 Sep. 2015, cbc.ca/news/indigenous/vancouver-daycare-teaches-residential-schools-1.3243358.

McGee, Chris. "Why Won't Melinda Just Talk about What Happened? *Speak* and the Confessional Voice." *Children's Literature Association Quarterly*, vol. 34, no. 2, Summer 2009, pp. 172-87.

McKegney, Sam. *Magic Weapons: Aboriginal Writers Remaking Community After Residential School*. U of Manitoba P, 2007. *Scholars Portal Books*, books1.scholarsportal.info/viewdoc.html?id=/ebooks/ebooks3/upress/2013-08-24/1/9780887553394.

McLaren, Peter. *Pedagogy of Insurrection: From Resurrection to Revolution*. Peter Lang, 2015.

Mendlesohn, Farah. "Crowing the King: *Harry Potter* and the Construction of Authority*." Ivory Tower and Harry Potter: Perspectives on a Literary Phenomenon*, edited by Lana A. Whited, U of Missouri P, 2002, pp. 159-81, *ProQuest Ebrary*, ebookcentral-proquest-com.ezproxy.lib.ucalgary.ca/lib/ucalgary-ebooks/reader.action?docID=3570766&query=.

Metcalf, Stephen. "Neoliberalism: The Idea that Swallowed the World." *The Guardian*, 19 Aug. 2017, theguardian.com/news/2017/aug/18/neoliberalism-the-idea-that-changed-the-world.

Mezzofiore, Gianluca. "No One in Her School Would Walk Out With Her. So Her Dad Did." *CNN*, 21 Apr. 2018, cnn.com/2018/04/20/us/girl-school-walk-out-dad-carlisle-trnd/index.html.

Miller, Laura. "Fresh Hell: What's Behind the Boom in Dystopian Fiction for Young Readers?" *The New Yorker*, 14 June 2010, newyorker.com/magazine/2010/06/14/fresh-hell-2.

Miller, Lisa. "Teens Already Know How to Overthrow the Government." *The Cut*, 16 Mar. 2018, https://www.thecut.com/2018/03/parkland-students-emma-gonzalez-david-hogg.html.

Milloy, John S. *A National Crime: The Canadian Government and the Residential School System*. U of Manitoba P, 1999.

---, and Paul Edwards. *"A National Crime": The Canadian Government and the Residential School System, 1879 to 1986*. U of Manitoba P, 2014. *ProQuest*, ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/york/reader.action?docID=3254217.

Mills, Alice. "Archetypes and the Unconscious in *Harry Potter* and Diana Wynne Jones's *Fire and Hemlock* and *Dogsbody.*" *Reading Harry Potter: Critical Essays*, edited by Giselle Liza Anatol, Praeger, 2003, pp. 3-14.

Moore, Mark, et al., editors. *Deadly Lessons: Understanding Lethal School Violence*. The National Academies P, 2003. *ProQuest*, ebookcentral-proquest-com.ezproxy.lib.ucalgary.ca/lib/ucalgary-ebooks/reader.action?docID=3375516&ppg=23.

Moss, Mark. *Manliness and Militarism: Educating Young Boys in Ontario for War*. Oxford UP, 2001.

Moylan, Tom. "'The Moment is Here . . . And It's Important': State, Agency, and Dystopia in Kim Stanley Robinson's *Antarctica* and Ursula K. Le Guin's *The Telling*." *Dark Horizons: Science Fiction and the Dystopian Imagination*, edited by Raffaella Baccolini and Tom Moylan, Routledge, 2003, pp. 135-54.

Musgrave, P. W. *From Brown to Bunter: The Life and Death of the School Story.* Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1985.

Myers, Christopher. "The Apartheid of Children's Literature." *The New York Times*, 15 Mar. 2014,.nytimes.com/2014/03/16/opinion/sunday/the-apartheid-of-childrens-literature.html\.

Neal, Bradi. "Harry-Potter Inspired Signs Totally Ruled Women's Marches Around the World." Bustle, 22 Jan. 2017, bustle.com/p/harry-potter-inspired-signs-totally-ruled-womens-marches-around-the-world-32206.

Nelson, Claudia. "The Angel in the School." *Boys will be Girls: The Feminine Ethic and British Children's, 1857-1917.* Rutgers UP, 1991.

Newbolt, John Henry. "Vitaï Lampada." *Admirals All*. 1897. *Poet's Corner*, theotherpages.org/poems/books/newbolt/admirals.html.

Newman, Katherine S, et al. *Rampage: The Social Roots of School Shootings*. Basic Books, 2004.

Nijkamp, Marieke. *This Is Where It Ends*. Sourcebooks, 2016.

---. "Q&A with Debut Author Marieke Nijkamp about This is Where It Ends." Interviewed by Cindy L. Rodriguez, 18 Jan. 2016, *Latinxs in Kid Lit*, latinosinkidlit.com/2016/01/18/qa-with-debut-author-marieke-nijkamp-about-this-is-where-it-ends/ latinosinkidlit.com/2016/01/18/qa-with-debut-author-marieke-nijkamp-about-this-is-where-it-ends/.

Nikolajeva, Maria. "Harry Potter and the Secrets of Children's Literature." *Critical Perspectives on Harry Potter*, edited by Elizabeth E. Heilman, Routledge, 2009, pp. 225-42.

Nodelman, Perry. *The Hidden Adult: Defining Children's Literature*. Johns Hopkins UP, 2008.

---. *The Pleasures of Children's Literature*. U of Winnipeg P, 1996.

---, and Mavis Reimer. *The Pleasures of Children's Literature 3rd Edition*. Pearson, 2003.

"No Name-Calling Week." *GLSEN*, glsen.org/no-name-calling-week.

Parker, Peter. *The Old Lie: The Great War and the Public-School Ethos*. Constable, 1987.

Parramore, Lynn. "The Corporate Plan to Groom U.S. Kids for Servitude by Wiping Out Public Schools." *New Economic Thinking*, 6 Apr. 2018, https://www.ineteconomics.org/perspectives/blog/the-corporate-plan-to-groom-u-s-kids-for-servitude-by-wiping-out-public-schools.

"Pensieve." *The Harry Potter Lexicon*, edited by Jeanne Kimsey, hp-lexicon.org/thing/pensieve/.

Petzold, Dieter. "Breaking in the Colt: Socialization in Nineteenth-Century School Stories." *Children's Literature Association Quarterly*, vol. 15, no. 1, Spring 1990, pp. 17-21, *Project Muse*, muse.jhu.edu/journals/chq/summary/v015/15.1.petzold.

Pinsent, Pat. "The Education of a Wizard: *Harry Potter* and His Predecessors." *The Ivory Tower and Harry Potter: Perspectives on a Literary Phenomenon*, edited by Lana A. Whited, U of Missouri P, 2002.

Poniewozik, James. "Casting a Black Hermione Granger Underscores a Key Harry Potter Theme." *The New York Times*, 21 Dec. 2015, nytimes.com/2015/12/21/arts/black-hermione-harry-potter-theme.html.

Pugh, Tison, and David L. Wallace. "A Postscript to 'Heteronormative Heroism and Queering the School Story in J. K. Rowling's *Harry Potter* Series.'" *Children's Literature Association Quarterly*, vol. 33, no. 2, Summer 2008, pp. 188-92, *Project Muse*, muse.jhu.edu.ezproxy.library.yorku.ca/article/237889/pdf.

---. "Heteronormative Heroism and Queering the School Story in J. K. Rowling's *Harry Potter* Series." *Children's Literature Association*, vol. 31, no. 3, Fall 2006, pp. 260-81, *Project Muse*, muse.jhu.edu.journals/chq/summary/v031/31.3wallace.html.

Quigly, Isabel. *The Heirs of Tom Brown: The English School Story.* Oxford UP, 1984.

Quinn, Ben. "Calls for Unity as Thousands Attend Anti-Brexit Rally in London." *The Guardian*, 9 Sept. 2017, theguardian.com/politics/2017/sep/09/brexit-pro-eu-demonstration-london.

Quinn, Dave. "A Woman's Place Is in the Resistance': The Best Signs from the Woman's Marches Around the World." *People*, 21 Jan. 2017, people.com/politics/womens-march-on-washington-best-signs.

Racette, Sherry Farrell. “Haunted: First Nations Children in Residential School Photography.” *Depicting Canada’s Children*, edited by Loren R. Lerner, Wilfrid Laurier UP, 2009, pp. 49-84.

Read, Christopher. “Revolutions (Russian Empire).” *International Encyclopedia of the First World War*, 8 Oct. 2014, encyclopedia.1914-1918-online.net/article/revolutions_russian_empire.

Reagan, Jones. “Great Movie Focuses on the Mental Effect of Bullying.” *Common Sense Media*, 6 Feb. 2016, commonsensemedia.org/users/reaganjones.

Rearick, Lauren. “7-Year-Old Havana Edwards on Why She Joined the National School Walkout.” *Teen Vogue*, 20 Apr. 2018, teenvogue.com/story/havana-edwards-interview-national-school-walkout.

Regan, Paulette. *Unsettling the Settler Within: Indian Residential Schools, Truth Telling, and Reconciliation in Canada.* UBC Press, 2010.

Reese, Debbie. “When We Were Alone.” *American Indians in Children’s Literature,* 23 Sep. 2016, americanindiansinchildrensliterature.blogspot.ca/2016/09/when-we-were-alone-by-david-alexander.html.

---. “I Am Not A Number.” *American Indians in Children’s Literature,* 16 June 2016, americanindiansinchildrensliterature.blogspot.ca/2016/06/i-am-not-number-by-jenny-kay-dupuis-and.html

---. “Stolen Words.” *American Indians in Children’s Literature*, 3 Dec. 2017, americanindiansinchildrensliterature.blogspot.ca/2017/12/not-recommended-stolen-words-by-melanie.html

Reynolds, Kimberly. "Words about War for Boys: Representations of Soldiers and Conflict in Writing for Children before World War I." *Children's Literature Association Quarterly*, vol. 34, no. 3, Fall 2009, pp. 255-71. *Project Muse*, muse.jhu.edu/article/315219.

Residential School Class Action Litigation. "Detailed Notice." *Residential School Settlement*, residentialschoolsettlement.ca/english_index.html.

Richards, Jeffrey. *Happiest Days: The Public Schools in English Fiction*. Manchester UP, 1988.

Robertson, Judith P. "What Happens to Our Wishes: Magical Thinking in Harry Potter." *Children's Literature Association Quarterly*, vol. 26, no. 4, 2002, pp. 198-211.

Romano, Aja. "The Harry Potter Universe Still Can't Translate its Gay Subtext to Text. It's a Problem." *Vox*, 4 Sep. 2016, vox.com/2016/9/4/12534818/harry-potter-cursed-child-rowling-queerbaiting.

Rose, Jacqueline. *The Case of Peter Pan or The Impossibility of Children's Fiction*. MacMillian P, 1984.

Rowling, J.K. "J.K. Rowling at Carnegie Hall Reveals Dumbledore is Gay." *The Leaky-Cauldron*, 20 Oct. 2007, the-leaky-cauldron.org/2007/10/20/j-k-rowling-at-carnegie-hall-reveals-dumbledore-is-gay-neville-marries-hannah-abbott-and-scores-more.

Sánchez-Jankowski, Martín. *Burning Dislike: Ethnic Violence in High Schools*. U of California P, 2016.

Sanders, Andrew. "Introduction." *Tom Brown's Schooldays*. Oxford UP, 1989, pp. vii-xxv.

Sargent, Lyman Tower. "The Three Faces of Utopianism Revisited." *Utopian Studies*, vol. 5, no. 1, June 1994, pp. 1-37. *EBSCOhost*, web.b.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.library.yorku.ca/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?sid=b7ded76c-07f1-4eee-86c5-0b78b9e06bbf%40sessionmgr101&vid=4&hid=124.

Saul, John Ralston. "Reconciliation: Four Barriers to Paradigm Shift." *Response, Responsibility, and Renewal: Canada's Truth and Reconciliation Journey,* edited by Gregory Youngling, Jonathan Dewar, and Mike DeGagné, Aboriginal Healing Foundation, 2009.

@savedbythepage. "We're all in this together." *Instagram*, 25 Mar. 2018, 20 instagram.com/p/Bgt1wGAgMOv/?hl=en&taken-by=savedbythepage.

Shary, Timothy. *Generation Multiplex: The Image of Youth in Contemporary American Cinema*. U of Texas P, 2002.

---. *Teen Movies: American Youth on Screen*. Wallflower, 2005.

"Shi-shi-etko." *Groundwood Products*, Groundwood Books, houseofanansi.com/products/shi-shi-etko.

Shklovsky, Viktor. "Art, as Device." Translated by Alexandra Berlina, *Poetics Today*, vol. 36, no. 3. Sept. 2015, pp. 151-74.

Short, Don. *Don't Be so Gay!: Queers, Bullying, and Making Schools Safe*. UBC P, 2013.

Sklar, Rachel. "Harry Potter Inspired the Parkland Generation." *CNN*, 26 Mar. 2018, cnn.com/2018/03/26/opinions/parkland-march-harry-potter-generation-opinion-sklar/index.html.

Skulnick, Rebecca, and Jesse Goodnow. "The Civic Leadership of Harry Potter: Agency, Ritual, and Schooling." *Harry Potter's World*, edited by Elizabeth E. Heilman, RoutledgeFalmer, 2003, pp. 261-77.

Smith, Karen Manners. "Harry Potter's Schooldays: J. K. Rowling and the British Boarding School Novel." *Reading Harry Potter*, edited by Giselle Lisa Anatol, Praeger, 2003, pp. 69-87.

"To S.P.E.W. or not to S.P.E.W.: Hermione Granger and the Pitfalls of Activism." *Pottermore*, pottermore.com/features/to-spew-or-not-to-spew-hermione-granger-and-the-pitfalls-of-activism.

Spring, Erin. "'Everyone Here Knows a Junior': Blackfoot Children and Their Books." *Bookbird*, vol. 54, no. 1, 2016, pp. 55-60, *Project Muse*, muse.jhu.edu/article/609657.

Stanek, Łukasz. *Henri Lefebvre on Space: Architecture, Urban Research, and the Production of Theory.* U of Minnesota P, 2011, ProQuest, ebookcentral-proquest-com.ezproxy.lib.ucalgary.ca/lib/ucalgary-ebooks/reader.action?docID=765500&ppg=8#.

Steege, David K. "Harry Potter, Tom Brown, and the British School Story: Lost in Transit*?" The Ivory Tower and* Harry Potter*: Perspectives on a Literary Phenomenon*, edited by Lana A. Whited, U of Missouri P, 2002, pp. 140-58.

"Students to Lawmakers: We're Children, You Are the Adults." *CNN*, 16 Feb. 2018, cnn.com/videos/us/2018/02/15/student-survivor-need-action-or-students-die-sot-newday.cnn.

Summers, Rachel. "7-Year-Old Havana Chapman-Edwards Fights for Girls Education in Ghana." *GhanaNation*, 25 June 2018, ghanagrio.com/news/470447-7-year-old-havana-chapman-edwards-fights-for-girls-education-in-ghana.html.

Tac0906. "I Reviewed Carrie (2013)." *Common Sense Media*, 21 Oct. 2013, commonsensemedia.org/users/tac0906.

Tarc, Aparna Mishra. *Literacy of the Other: Renarrating Humanity*. State U of New York, 2015.

Thomsen, Jacqueline. "First Grade is Only Student at Her School to Walk Out Over Gun Violence." *The Hill*, 20 Apr. 2018, thehill.com/blogs/blog-briefing-room/news/384190-first-grader-is-only-student-at-her-school-to-walk-out-over-gun.

@TheTinyDiplomat. "I am all alone at my school, but I know I am not alone." *Twitter*, 20 Apr. 2018, 7:19 a.m., twitter.com/TheTinyDiplomat/status/987334885886119937/photo/1?ref_src=twsrc%5Etfw%7Ctwcamp%5Etweetembed%7Ctwterm%5E987334885886119937&ref_url=http%3A%2F%2Faplus.com%2Fa%2Fhavana-edwards-chapman-national-school-walkout-columbine-anniversary%3Fno_monetization%3Dtrue.

---. "My Speech for @NationalDieIn in Dec today." *Twitter*, 12 June 2018, 10:41 a.m., twitter.com/TheTinyDiplomat/status/1006592326188269568?ref_src=twsrc%5Etfw%7Ctwcamp%5Etweetembed%7Ctwterm%5E1006592326188269568&ref_url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.refinery29.com%2F2018%2F06%2F201622%2Fhavana-chapman-edwards-7-year-old-activist-pulse-shooting.

Tosenberger, Catherine. "Homosexuality at the Online Hogwarts: *Harry Potter* Slash Fanfiction." *Children's Literature*, vol. 36, 2008, pp. 185-207, *Project Muse*, muse.jhu.edu.ezproxy.library.yorku.ca/article/237810/pdf.

Tribunella, Eric L. "Refusing the Queer Potential: John Knowles's *Separate Peace*." *Children's Literature*, vol. 30, 2002, pp. 81-95, *Project Muse*, doi:10.1353/chl.0.0760.

---. *Melancholia and Maturation: The Use of Trauma in American Children's Literature*. U of Tennessee P, 2010.

Trites, Roberta Seelinger. *Disturbing the Universe: Power and Repression in Adolescent Literature*. U of Iowa P, 2000.

Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada. *Honouring the Truth, Reconciling for the Future: Summary of the Final Report of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of*

Canada. Library and Archives Canada Cataloguing in Publication, 2015. *TRC*, nctr.ca/assets/reports/Final%20Reports/Executive_Summary_English_Web.pdf.

---. *The Survivors Speak: A Report of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada*. Library and Archives Canada Cataloguing in Publication, 2015. *TRC,* nctr.ca/assets/reports/Final%20Reports/Survivors_Speak_English_Web.pdf.

---. *Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada: Calls to Action*. Library and Archives Canada Cataloguing in Publication, 2015. *TRC,* nctr.ca/assets/reports/Calls_to_Action_English2.pdf.

---. "FAQ's." *TRC*, trc.ca/websites/trcinstitution/index.php?p=10.

Tucker, Nicholas. "The Rise and Rise of Harry Potter." *Children's Literature in Education*, vol. 30, no. 4, Dec. 1999, pp. 221-34.

van Emden, Richard. *Boy Soldiers of the Great War*. Bloomsbury, 2012.

Ventura, Abbie. "Predicting a Better Situations? Three Young Adult Speculative Fiction Texts and the Possibilities for Social Change." *Children's Literature Association Quarterly*, vol. 36, no. 1, Spring 2011, pp. 89-103. *Project Muse*, doi.org/10.1353/chq.2011.0006.

Villacis, Devin. "First-Grade Channels Her Civil Rights Heroes as Only One to Walk Out of Class in Protest." *ABC News*, 21 Apr. 2018, abcnews.go.com/US/grader-channels-civil-rights-heroes-walk-class-protest/story?id=54628294.

Vincent, Andrew. *Modern Political Ideologies: 3rd Edition*. Wiley-Blackwell, 2010.

Vizenor, Gerald. "Aesthetics of Survivance." *Survivance: Narratives of Native Presence*, edited by Gerald Vizenor, U of Nebraska P, 2008, pp. 1-24.

Vowel, Chelsea. *Indigenous Writes: A Guide to First Nations, Métis, and Inuit Issues in Canada*. Portage & Main P, 2016. *ProQuest*, ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/york/reader.action?docID=4832580.

Walsh, Mark. "Growing Up on the Award-Winning 'Degrassi' Series." *Education Week*, 13 Dec. 1989, edweek.org/ew/articles/1989/12/13/09190014.h09.html.

wa Thiong'o, Nugugi. *Decolonising the Mind: The Politics of Language in African Literature*. Heinemann, 1986.

Webber, Julie A. *Beyond Columbine: School Violence and the Virtual*. Peter Lang, 2017, *ProQuest*, ebookcentral-proquest-com.ezproxy.lib.ucalgary.ca/lib/ucalgary-ebooks/reader.action?docID=4874557.

Westerfeld, Scott. "Teens and Dystopia." *Scott Westerfeld*, 13 Sept. 2012, scottwesterfeld.com/blog/2012/09/teens-and-dystopias/.

Westman, Karen E. "The Weapon We Have Is Love." *Children's Literature Association Quarterly*, vol. 33, no. 2, Summer 2008, pp. 193-99, *Project Muse*, muse-jhu-edu.ezproxy.library.yorku.ca/article/237890/pdf.

"When I Was Eight." *Annick Press Products*, Annick Press, annickpress.com/When-I-Was-Eight.

"When We Were Alone." *Portage & Main Press Products*, Highwater Press, portageandmainpress.com/product/when-we-were-alone/.

"Who We Are: Our Mission." *National School Walkout*, nationalschoolwalkout.net/who-we-are/.

Wolf, Doris, and Paul DePasquale. "Home and Native Land: A Study of Canadian Aboriginal Picture Books by Aboriginal Authors*." Home Words: Discourses of Children's Literature in Canada*, edited by Mavis Reimer, Wilfrid Laurier UP, 2008, pp. 87-106.

Woods, Katherine. "A Brilliant Journalist." *New York Times*, 9 Feb. 1941, *ProQuest Historical Newspapers*.

Young, Hugh H. "Military Training Would Make Us a New Race." *New York Times*, 7 Jan. 1917, *New York Times Archives Online*, article.archive.nytimes.com/1917/01/07/10230810.

"Youth Violence: Data & Statistics." *Centers for Diseases Control and Prevention*, 22 Aug. 2017, cdc.gov/violenceprevention/youthviolence/schoolviolence/data_stats.html.

Zembylas, Michalinos. "Researching 'Emotional Geographies' in Schools: The Value of Critical Ethnography." *Methods of Exploring Emotion*, edited by Helena Flam and Jochen Klere, Routledge, 2015, pp.181-90.

Zieger, Susan. "The Schoolhouse vs. The Armory: U.S. Teachers and the Campaign Against Militarism in the Schools, 1914-1918*." Journal of Women's History*, vol. 15, no. 2, Summer 2003, pp. 150-231, *Project Muse*, https://muse.jhu.edu/article/45686.

Zipes, Jack. *Sticks and Stones: The Troublesome Success of Children's Literature from Slovenly Peter to Harry Potter*. New York: Routledge, 2001.

--. "Foreword." *Utopian and Dystopian Writing for Children and Young Adults*, edited by Carrie Hintz and Elaine Ostry, Routledge, 2003, pp. ix-xi.